



8

HISTORIC NOTES

OF

PROTESTANT MISSIONS

TO THE

ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

BY

C. W. ANDREWS.

WOODHOUSE & PARHAM,

RICHMOND, VA.

1866.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries.

HISTORIC NOTES

OF

PROTESTANT MISSIONS

TO THE

ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

BY

C. W. ANDREWS.

WOODHOUSE & PARHAM,

RICHMOND, VA.

1866.

GEORGE KNAPP & Co.,
Printers and Binders, St. Louis, Mo.

P R E F A C E.

1. It is proposed to give, in the following Notes,

- a.* A brief statement of the distinctive doctrines of the Greek Church.
- b.* A sketch of the rise and conduct of Protestant Episcopal Missions in the East.
- c.* A review of the answers sent by Dr. Hill in reply to the questions addressed to him by the Special Committee, appointed by the Board of Missions in 1859, touching the conduct of the Mission at Athens.
- d.* Some notice of the reported debate upon said Mission at the meeting of the Board in 1865.

2. No part of Missionary history abounds with more instructive facts than an adequate and impartial statement of what has taken place under the auspices of the American Episcopal Church in the East since 1830, certainly none which relates to the conflicts of Protestantism with the lapsed Churches of Eastern Europe and Western Asia.

3. The ensuing Notes do not relate to a dead issue. The Board of Missions has been agitated by it for twenty years, and will continue to be agitated by it in proportion to the presence in it of evangelic intelligence and life, and the success of any who may have the hardihood to bring the facts to its knowledge. The action had at its last meeting was new, and is pregnant with further consequences.

4. Every fact heretofore alleged by the author with regard to the doctrinal teaching in the School at Athens will, in the course of these Notes, be put beyond further cavil or dispute.

5. Nothing is claimed to be settled by the assertions of the present writer, and nothing will at this stage of the enquiry be admitted as settled by the mere assertion of any party whatsoever unless sustained by other and corroborative proofs.

6. In very kindness to the parties most concerned, I began twenty years ago with excuses and half-apologetic statements for facts which were nevertheless proved; but, so far from its being appreciated or producing any good effect, it seemed to be taken as an evidence of timidity, and was followed by unworthy personal aggressions, which will not be noticed in this tract. It is now time for the supporters of the Mission at Athens to meet the issue raised upon the whole body of evidence submitted. They are bound not only as Protestants, but as honorable and conscientious men, before the world, sitting in a legislative and judicial capacity, to say whether the documents submitted from the hands of the teachers themselves have been sufficiently met, or met at all. No man can be listened to with respect until he first meets this question, even if all the additional facts which follow could be set aside, as I believe none of them can be.

7. Had the facts been admitted and the plea entered that they took place under pressure of the Greek priesthood and that a change had since taken place, the case would have been different; but, so far from this, all has been justified from the start, and we are told that there has been *no* change in the system of teaching pursued. This last statement is doubtless true, though I had supposed it possible or probable that after the disclosures of 1858, if not of 1842, some change had been silently made; but now it appears, or will appear before we have done, that in 1860, while the answers to the questions of the Special Committee were being so elaborately prepared in Athens, the doctrines of the Greek Church were being as fully taught in the School as ever.

8. The leading facts and arguments which follow were prepared for the Board at its meeting in 1861, and would have been submitted, had the author been present, as the Report of the Committee of Investigation appointed in 1859, had the majority adopted them, otherwise as a Minority Report. The reasons why they were not submitted in 1860 will appear in their place.

9. While parties have been partially mingled about this matter as a question of fact, they have, so far as I know, with a single exception, been long and wholly separated upon it as a question of principle. A portion of one side does not believe that the chief points which distinguish our Church from the unreformed have been yielded in the religious teaching at Athens; if they did, they would at once vote to dissolve our connection with it; while none of the other side have disclosed any concern whether those points have been yielded or not.

10. But party should have no influence upon this enquiry. No man e. g. is more thoroughly convinced than the present writer of the evils of Puritanism, and the disastrous tendencies of that form of religious dissent and speculation which took its rise in the 16th and 17th centuries, or of the Scriptural and Apostolic character of our own Church, or of its indispensable necessity to the conservation of those Evangelic doctrines preached by Christ and his Apostles, and which alone can save the soul from sin and death; and that now more than ever it should command the devotion of all its members, clerical and lay, for its propagation and for its defence both against aggression from without and corruption from within. But what has this to do with the question of fact, whether the doctrinal teaching in a Mission School at Athens be or be not that of the Greek Church? Party spirit, on whatever grounds it may rest, is in any of its forms unfriendly to the light, and in some of its forms an insurmountable bar to all fairness and truth, alike insensible to argument, to experience, and to fact.

11. A copy of these Notes will be forwarded to the members of the Board of Missions so far as their address is known.

N O T E S .

The doctrines of the Greek Church are not as readily ascertained as those of Protestant Churches, their Confessions of Faith and other symbols never having been so compendiously embraced in single publications. The two differ in this respect as what is called the English Constitution differs from those of Republican States. That which answers to our "Articles of Religion," is to be found in the Decrees of Councils held in different ages; and that which answers to the doctrinal teaching of our Liturgy, is gathered from their different catechisms and devotional works, approved by Synods, and with about the same degree of symbolic authority.

The originals of these, with two exceptions, I have not seen; but translations of them have been made which cannot be discredited, besides learned and impartial treatises made before the present controversies arose. Of these, perhaps the most elaborate are the works of Dr. Jno. Glenn King, Chaplain to the British factory in St. Petersburg, (London, 1772, 4to,) and especially that of the learned Dr. Covell, (Cambridge, 1722, fol.,) who was in Constantinople when the question was agitated between the Jesuits and the ambassadors of England and Holland, as to the authoritative teaching of the Greek Church upon one of the most important points now in debate.

We are only concerned at present about those points which are held vital to the Protestant religion, and on which turned our separation from the Church of Rome, in the 16th century—Mariolatry, saint and image worship, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and purgatory.

On these articles of faith the Greek Church acknowledges and teaches whatever is taught in the Seventh General Council, (the second of Nice,) held in 787; the Council of Jerusalem, 1672 (ten years later than the final adjustment of our own standards); as also, in Greece, whatever is contained in the Euchologion, the Synopsis, and catechisms, especially the one imposed by public authority upon all schools, which will come under more particular notice hereafter.

From these voluminous authorities, of course no more than samples can be given in these Notes; but they will be sufficient, and no honest disputant, acquainted with the subject, will say that they are calculated to make an unfair impression of the whole.

I. MARIOLATRY, SAINT, IMAGE AND PICTURE WORSHIP.

Greece became the hot-bed of Christian idolatry, as it had previously been of pagan. There it originated, and from thence it spread into Italy and Asia. Its beginnings are not, at this distance of time, to be traced, if indeed the passion for idolatry had ever been eradicated from the Greek mind. But it was not until the early part of the 8th century that it assumed a symbolical form and pressed for ecclesiastical recognition and authority, and the power to issue anathemas and persecuting canons. It was in vain that the iconoclastic Emperors, from Leo the Isaurian onward for fifty years, endeavored to stem the tide against an army of ignorant and fanatical monks. It was in vain that one of them had influence enough to procure a Synod (754) which pronounced the then reigning practice an utter corruption of Christianity, and the renewal of paganism. It was in vain that witnesses of its abominations were produced, or evidences submitted, that it was the idolatry of the Church itself which, beyond anything else, made Christianity the scoff of Saracens and Jews. The majority were insensible to such considerations. The last imperial opponent was removed by poison, to make way for the Seventh General Council, which was assembled by the authority of the infamous Irene in 787, where even candid Romish historians admit that the chief speakers were either dishonest or betrayed the grossest ignorance of facts. "Undoubtedly," says a more recent author, who seems to have read their debates and proceedings at large, "whatever may be thought of the decisions to which this Council committed itself, no well informed person can deny that more contemptible pleadings have rarely been heard with applause by any body of educated men." But alas! it happened then as it has happened since. It was a foregone conclusion. Image worship was added to the creed of the Church. Painting and sculpture divided the honors of the new divinities. Constantinople chose the painted, Rome the sculptured form. The statues of the Virgin and saints adorned the niches of Latin Christianity, while their pictures bedizened the walls of the East. The *worship* was the same in each, while the learned in both, for convenience of dispute, adopted the same frivolous distinctions between *λουλεια*, *ὑπερδουλεια* and *λατρία*. The multitude, however, from that day to this, both clerical and lay, worshipped images in every sense in which their heathen ancestors had worshipped them; for the learned few among the pagans, no less than themselves, claimed not to worship the wood or stone or paint, but invisible deities under those forms.

It is needless to go into an examination of the decrees of the Seventh Council, as they are accessible to every reader of Church history.

The decrees of the Council of Jerusalem may be seen at large in the work of Dr. Covell. In the Articles of Faith submitted by the Synod of Constantinople, (republished at Athens in 1844, "with the blessing" of the Greek Synod,) which quotes largely from the Council of Jerusalem, we have their doctrine upon "the holy pictures and worship of saints" as follows: "We honor those who are truly saints, and declared

mediators by the Church, as the friends of God, and as supplicating him on our behalf. We honor them in a two-fold manner: in one mode, which we call hyperdulia, the mother of the divine Word; for if the parent of God be confessedly the servant, yet is she also the mother of the only God, as having brought forth in the flesh one person of the Trinity, for which reason she is lauded, [&c. In the second mode, in paying honor to angels, &c., we offer the worship termed dulia. We also worship and honor the wood of the precious and life-giving cross; the stall at Bethlehem; the life-giving Sepulchre, &c. We worship, honor and salute the pictures of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the super-holy Mother of God, of all the saints and the holy angels.”

In the Catechism of Darbaris, (of which more in its place,) taught in every school in Greece at the time of my visit, except Mr. Hildner's, of the Church Missionary Society, (the only one of those which refused which was not broken up,) the doctrine is thus laid down, page 36 :

“To honor the saints not as God himself, but as ministers of God, who supplicate him for our salvation. Hence, that person sins inexcusably, and much against the commandment, who offers to the ministers of God almost the same honor which he offers to God, who hopes almost as much in them as in God himself, who *prays more and oftener to them* than to God himself, who celebrates their memory or their days with *more reverence* than the feast of the Lord, who honors their pictures *more* than that of our Saviour,” &c.

There is no difference between this and the teaching of the Church of Rome upon the same point. The practical workings of it we shall see in their books of devotion, which are almost exclusively filled with prayers to the Virgin and saints. Dr. King (p. 10) says: “Their worship has degenerated into absolute idolatry.”

From the Euchologion I offer, under this head, but a few specimens out of a large number now before me, of the idolatrous prayers which have been constructed in accordance with the dogmatic teachings of Councils, and which are known by every one acquainted with the subject to form the staple of all their books of devotion. I am at no pains to select an extreme example, but take the first which offers. It professes to be from the edition printed at Venice, in 1839 (p. 388) : *

“To whom shall I cry? Who will hear out of my anguish the groans of my heart, unless thou, all-holy Virgin, the hope of Christians and of all sinners?”

So in the Synopsis, which contains the Communion service, page 192 : “O super-holy sovereign lady, Mother of God, light of my darkened soul, my hope, protection, solace, refuge and glory, I thank thee thou hast made me worthy,” &c.

* All the translations from the Euchologion and Synopsis I transcribe from the letters of H. Newton, written at Smyrna, and published in the London Record, in 1845.

II. AURICULAR CONFESSION.

With respect to this article I am not aware of there being any dispute.

III. PURGATORY.

Dr. King says (p. 17): "The Greek Church admits prayers and services for the dead, and even pray for the remission of their sins; but it does by no means allow the doctrine of *purgatory*." But that this judicious and candid author mistook the mere non-prescription of *fire* as the mode of punishment for a rejection of the doctrine itself, we are led to infer from the eighteenth article of the Synod of Constantinople, which reads as follows: "We believe that the souls of the deceased go immediately into a state of joy or of woe; that the souls of those who have been defiled by mortal sin, who have not died in despair, who repented while yet alive, but did not exhibit the fruits of repentance, such as the shedding of tears, kneeling with watchings, prayers, afflictions, and relieving the poor, go to Hades and endure punishment for the sins which they have committed, but are in expectation of deliverance from that place, and they are liberated through the prayers of the priests and the pious offerings which the relatives of each make for the departed; the unbloody sacrifice being of the greatest efficacy which each of the relations in particular offers for the departed, and which the Catholic and Apostolic Church daily offers in common for all; this being further understood, that we know not the time of their deliverance; for that such are delivered from their suffering before the general resurrection and judgment we learn and believe, but of the time we are ignorant."

IV. TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

This dogma, first propounded in the ninth century, was incorporated into the creed of the Roman Church by a Council called by Innocent III. in 1225, in these words: "In which Church Jesus Christ himself is the very priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar are contained under the species of bread and wine, they being transubstantiated by divine power, the bread into the body, and the wine into the blood." In the seventeenth decree of the Council of Jerusalem it is adopted in the following terms: "When the priest consecrates the elements, the very substance of the bread and wine are transformed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ." Of the whole decree, Dr. Covell says: "It is as large and full as if Bellarmine and all the Tridentine fathers had been present at the making of it." It is needless to quote the Synod of Constantinople, which lays down the doctrine at great length and in the most circumstantial and explicit terms, ending with these words: "Further, the body and blood of our Lord in the sacrament of the Eucharist ought to be honored and *worshipped* with the very *highest* act of adoration, for the worship of our Lord and of His body and blood is the same." The Synopsis and Catechism are equally explicit.

V. THE RULE OF FAITH.

The Synod of Constantinople has the following article: "We believe the Scriptures without doubting; not otherwise, however, than as the Catholic Church has interpreted it. * * * The testimony of the Catholic Church we believe not inferior to what is contained in Scripture."

VI. JUSTIFICATION.

Article thirteen of same Synod: "We believe that not by faith only is a man justified, but by faith which works also by love; that is to say, by faith and works; and we hold it a doctrine of utter impiety to say that simple faith, performing the function of a hand, can apprehend the righteousness (of Christ). We believe the contrary to this, that it is not faith by the imputation of anything, but the faith that is in us which through our works justifies us before Christ. We judge that works are not mere indications of what is in us, but are fruits to be independently considered, by means of which faith obtains what is practicable (*i. e.* may be earned), and are in themselves meritorious through the divine promise to enable each of the faithful to receive the things done in the body." Such, in brief, is the *doctrine* of the Greek Church. *It is essentially the doctrine of the Church of Rome.* The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and some other points about which they differ and have so long contended, come rather under the head of discipline than of doctrine.*

* Were it not impertinent to submit an individual opinion in connection with such authorities, I might cite that of Bishop Whittingham as found in his edition of Jewell's Apology (1846, note, p. 184). More, I think, might have been made out for the Greeks as against Rome than is found in this note, or than I have seen in any of their apologists (of whom Bp. W. is not one), on the score of the Romish doctrine of *merits*, such a prolific source of heresy and corruption, and which the Greeks do not seem to have embraced. However, as the Bishop says, their corruptions are the same, identical with those of Rome, some similar and some opposite. "The monastic system," he says, "and image worship, and the intercession of saints, are even more rife among them than among the Romanists. As for titles, their Chief Patriarch, it is true, does not arrogate to himself the universal bishopric or vicarage of Christ upon earth; but for high-sounding epithets of reverence and honor, for disgusting obsequiousness in the lower orders of the clergy, and unchristian assumptions of proud superiority by their dignitaries, they are, if anything, worse than Rome itself." The Bishop sums up very candidly and sensibly as follows: "It is hard to strike the balance between accounts so charged with evil on either side. It is certainly unsafe to appeal to either party in evidence against the other. For centuries the East and the West have been diverging from primitive truth and order by widely different ways; *the point of departure lies almost equally remote from both.*"

With respect to a Pope—if we take the general systems of the two Churches as true, which they are not—I should think the having such an officer attended with considerable advantages. Certainly the West has got along much better with one than the East without. It cannot be denied that Rome has exhibited greater theological and practical energy, a greater capacity for propagation, and has matured more of the fruits of spiritual religion.

But some have attempted to make the impression that though these were *once* the doctrines of the Church, or may be now in its *books*, yet that practically there has been a change, and that there is now a disposition to relax, and that they have been at least conciliated to Protestantism, and may, by a judicious course, be still further conciliated and won from idolatry. All this has been taken for granted or received upon the general assertions of individuals who are parties to the present policy. But there is not one particle of tangible proof, such as an impartial adjudication of the question demands. On the contrary, the *proof* is all the other way. No man in a public and responsible position in any country where the Greek religion prevails would dare to commit himself to this proposition. Can any action of any Synod be appealed to which gives the shadow of ground for such an opinion? Has any Bishop or ecclesiastic of standing ever made any response to the numerous approaches made them, or so much as written a private letter to any Protestant, on which any such hope can be founded? Who can produce any such thing, or anything whatever which would be received as evidence in a court of justice? The Priesthood, *i. e.* those who are leaders, are as well informed, as vigilant and as determined to resist innovation as the Romish Priesthood. If it be said there has not yet been time to ascertain the probable results of an experiment, we submit that such experiments are not as new as some seem to imagine. The Church of Rome, with no difference of creed to which *we* attach any importance, has been making these experiments for more than a thousand years, aided by the superior education, diplomacy and military power of the West, but with little success, and all they have had has been in the shape of secession.

One attempt at least has been made at reformation from within, and this by a Patriarch, who, alone of the long succession which has occupied the throne of Constantinople for the last ten centuries, deserves any attention.

None had resisted with greater energy the intrigues of the Papacy to reduce the Churches of the East to the jurisdiction of Rome than Cyril Lucar. He is represented as a man of great erudition and knowledge of the world. He had travelled over the greater part of Europe, was well acquainted with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome, and also of the Churches of the Reformation, and had corresponded with Abbot, then Archbishop of Canterbury. But imprudently declaring his appreciation of the Churches of England and Holland, and his purpose to reform the doctrine and ritual of the Greeks, and bring them into greater conformity to the Scriptures, his destruction was speedily plotted by both Jesuits and Greeks, and he was strangled by order of the Sultan in 1638. His successor, the Bishop of Bœrea, who had been the chief instrument of accomplishing the death of Cyril Lucar, openly declared for Rome, and it was thought by the Holy See that the reconciliation of the Greeks was then certain. But the fate of Cyril awaited the new Patriarch, and he was strangled in his turn

and succeeded by a determined enemy of Rome, as he doubtless was of the Protestants.

But of all the stratagems of the Holy See, that was most hopeful, as it was best conceived, which issued in the Council of Florence in 1439. The Turk was then pressing at the gates of Constantinople. The corrupt and effeminate Greeks, everywhere overcome in battle, were reduced to extreme distress; in peril not only of political but religious extinction. This was the Pope's opportunity to wrench from the victim those articles of his faith which had stood in the way of the Pope's ambition. Military succors were offered in exchange for ecclesiastical subserviency. The Greek deputies at the Council, including an Archbishop of Russia, were persuaded to receive the "filioque" into the Nicene Creed, Rome consenting to an artful interpretation to save the credit of the deputies at home. Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, and Cardinal Julian, representing the hitherto hostile sections of Christianity, embraced each other in the presence of the multitude. High Mass according to the Latin ritual, the "filioque" being included in the creed, was sung* in the cathedrals of Florence, and the reunion was effected. But when the deputies returned to Constantinople they were received with indignation and charged with having betrayed the orthodox faith, and were only able to excuse their simplicity by saying that they "did not well understand the intoning to which they had listened in the Latin tongue."

The year 1453 saw the last of the successors of Constantine, but the Greeks boasted that with the fall of their country they had preserved the integrity of their faith.

We may admire the fidelity or pertinacity exhibited through so many ages in defence of their hereditary system, but grave doubts will arise whether dogmas and traditions consolidated by so many Councils and Synods, and which for a thousand years have resisted the whole moral and diplomatic power of Western Europe, are likely to yield to the appliances of a female school at Athens, with its religious department under the supervision of the native priesthood, or a Russo-Greek committee located in New York. This brings us to some historic notes of the advances made by Protestants to these churches. Fuller notes would show that in some instances the parties approached were better informed of the Protestant religion than the parties who approached them were of the Greek, and in every instance where the proceedings advanced an inch beyond empty compliments, they met a prompt, if not indignant rebuff.

* The Greek ecclesiastic who recently visited New York was more successful, for the service celebrated there in his presence, we are boastfully told, was *without* the "filioque;" not that the present writer regards its omission on that occasion, or on all occasions, as of the smallest consequence, for, although the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father is evidently a scriptural idea, yet the Scriptures do not declare it in terms, and even Pierson admits that Rome foisted the "filioque" into a creed which did not originally contain it, and without Conciliar authority.

Early in the eighteenth century the ecclesiastical authorities of the English Church attempted, by correspondence, to enter into negotiations with the Greeks. The attempt ended with an elaborate communication from the latter, from which the following is an extract :

“Jeremiah, the most all-holy Patriarch of Constantinople, New Rome ; Athanasius, most bland Patriarch of Antioch ; Chrysanthus, most blessed Patriarch of Jerusalem ; and the most sacred Metropolitan Archbishops, the Archbishops and Bishops, with the whole body of the oriental and orthodox Clergy—To the most Reverend the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy in Great Britain : We have received, in the form of a pamphlet, to our first answer (so written). We now again reply briefly, saying, that, having carefully read your second letter, we have understood its purport and have only to repeat what we have already said, that the doctrines of our Church have been a long time ago examined and defined by the holy and ecumenical Synod, and it is not lawful to add or diminish aught from these, and that whosoever wishes to be of the same mind with us must wholly submit with a sincere obedience, without further investigation or inquisitiveness, to the doctrines which have been definitely declared by the Fathers and by the Holy Synods from the time of the Apostles and the Fathers of our Church, in regular succession, to this day. Let this be a sufficient answer to what has been written by you. But for your further satisfaction we send you, in complete form, the exposition of the orthodox faith of our Oriental Church, as it has been most accurately drawn up by the Synod of Jerusalem, held in the year 1672. If you will agree with these our doctrines you shall be altogether one with us, and there shall be no more differences between us.” Then follow the Articles of Faith, eighteen in number, from which extracts have already been made. The object of the Greek ecclesiastics in that communication was precisely the same as that of the present writer, viz: to let the Protestants know honestly what their doctrines were, and how vain it would be in them to expect any change on their part. And it is instructive to note the fact that this very communication was republished, “with the blessing of the Holy Synod,” at Athens in 1844. It was the evident purpose of the Synod to let the Protestants know how their advances would be received. What has been the quality of these advances, and how they have been received, will appear in the sequel.

It is an ungracious task to speak of the moral condition of the Greek Church, whether in Russia, Turkey, the Austrian Provinces, Greece, or the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria. It embraces about 66,000,000, only about 1,000,000 of whom belong to Greece proper. I will not submit the results of personal observations and enquiries during a residence of half a year in the Levant, further than to say that I usually inquired of missionaries and other pious foreign residents, whether, among the acquaintances they had formed with the members of those churches, clerical or lay, they had met with any who would be regarded in the Protestant sense of the term, as converted persons. The reply in every case was: “Not one.” That there *are* none, however, it is

competent to no man to affirm. But there is no mistaking the testimony of all sorts of witnesses. Setting aside all such as may be supposed by their opponents to have a case to make out, the voice of history is uniform and decisive. With some exceptions, doubtless, the priesthood itself is grossly immoral and flagitious. For more than three centuries the see of Constantinople has been sold, and simony descends through the whole hierarchy. Ecclesiastical elections are not unfrequently the scandal of heretics and infidels.*

The priests are commonly from the lowest ranks of society. Rev. R. Burgess, Prebendary of St. Paul's, London, (lecture upon "Greek Christianity," of which he had been a personal observer,) speaking of the Russian priesthood says: "They are generally sunk in ignorance and depravity, frequently performing their sacred functions in a state of intoxication." The extreme wickedness of the masses (than whom none are more devout worshippers of the Virgin and pictures,) has made them a by-word and scoff of Jews and Turks.

Sad as these facts are, doctrinal and practical, to every Christian mind, they are historic and incontestable. They doubtless made and must still make a strong appeal to the Protestant evangelical missionary spirit to attempt the restoration of these churches to the faith of the Gospel. The interest of the "Church Missionary Society" was awakened by the visit of the Rev. Mr. Jowett and his "Missionary researches in the Mediterranean." He was a man of deeply religious and ardent spirit. The sight of Athens moved him as it moved the Apostle "when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." The work was inaugurated in the line of evangelical religion. To this the Church Missionary Society and its missionaries have steadily adhered, and it is a noticeable fact that every missionary sent out by us professed the same principles. All have

* The following notice of the election of the Patriarch in 1860, is from the *Levant Herald*. It would not have been admitted here but for its numerous parallels in authentic Church history. It seems that the initiative is taken in a Communal Assembly, which sends a list of names to the Porte, which, rejecting such as it pleases, returns the list to the Assembly, when an election takes place, and the three highest names are sent to the Bishops, from which three they are to elect a Patriarch. The Assembly were intent upon a reform, (political, not religious.) Of the three names which they sent up, their favorite had twice as many votes as any other, but it became plain that there was no chance of his election if all the Bishops were allowed to vote. So it was proposed in the Assembly to exclude all those Bishops against whom charges had been preferred by their respective Dioceses for ecclesiastical and moral delinquencies, "when," says the *Herald*, "a regular Donnybrook tournament began. * * * In a few minutes the fight became general—Archdeacons attacked Bishops, and Bishops Archbishops, and the whole each other wherever there was an opponent's head to be cracked or beard to be pulled. The Bishop of Decapolis narrowly escaped strangulation by the Archdeacon of Adrianople, who in his turn lost three-quarters of his beard by the hands of a layman, who came to the Episcopal rescue. The presiding officer finally escaped, pronouncing the Assembly dissolved in the name of the Sultan."

The Sultan, however, soon caused the non-reforming candidate to be elected.

changed; and all but one, after total failure, abandoned the field, or rather were withdrawn. This change would never have called forth a word, had it not involved the missionary constituency in the support of measures which a large portion of them believed to be a practical surrender of Protestantism. But to the history, both of opinions and facts.

About the year 1830 there was a general impression that the idolatrous churches of the East could, by respectful, fraternal and sympathizing conference, be persuaded to give up their corruptions. All shared in this hope, both non-Episcopal societies and the Church of England and our own, and all made the experiment. The foundation of this hope is in no way obscure. It arose from the too ready acceptance, by those who first went out to explore, of the flattering words so universal among the Orientals when nothing serious is apprehended. A special ground of hope on our part was that a common Episcopacy would open the door to their confidence, which would further be won by acknowledging the integrity of their ecclesiastical character, and submitting all reformatory measures to their approval, and taking care not to give offence. Hence, the character of the first missionary "instructions."

There lay against the success of this plan the antecedent improbability that churches so old and founded by the Apostles would be likely to listen with respect to one so young as ours, so remote, and which they regarded as far inferior to their own except in secular advantages.

It was also likely to be ascertained that we had greatly overrated the *relative* importance of the points of *agreement*, and as much underrated those of *disagreement*. There was also the historical fact that no lapsed Church had ever been reformed by parties from without coming in and working in subjection to the authority of such Church.

Experiment in no very long time proved to all except ourselves the utter impracticability of working this plan with a clear conscience, or to any good purpose for the Greeks, and it has been abandoned by all others for twenty-five years. The most hopeful prospect was with the Syrian churches of Travancore, where the vast energy and wisdom and patience of Bishop Wilson were all exhausted upon the vain endeavor to effect anything of spiritual value through the heads of these churches. The details of that effort are elaborate and most instructive. With his profound regard for ecclesiastical order, his clear perception of Gospel truth and his uncompromising faithfulness to it, no man probably ever combined so many qualities for conducting such an experiment to a successful issue. After several years of labor, generous expenditure and fruitless negotiations, it became evident that the same effort might as well have been expended upon so many Roman Catholics. The plan was abandoned totally with the approval of all in England, (except extremists of the Tractarian party,) and missionaries were instructed to preach the Gospel boldly, and receive converted Syrians in common with converted Roman Catholics and converted heathen into distinct reformed Protestant congregations.

We remain the solitary adherent to that plan, which has been reduced

upon our hands to a profitable female boarding-school at Athens, whose Superintendent is Chaplain to the English Legations.

It will be first in place to note the "*instructions*" upon which the first Missionaries were started and of which so much use has been made:—The first to Messrs. Robertson and Hill, in 1830, were never printed, and it was stated at a meeting of the Board that they were not to be found. They are said to have been given by Bishop White at the request of the Society. Subsequently, a Report of the Foreign Committee contained the following extract, though how preserved does not appear: "*In all your works and words, your exercises, conversations and teachings, either public or private, as well as in every work prepared by you for the press, the Society desires to be very express and peremptory in the expression of their opinion, that you are by no means to say or write or do anything which may justly give rise to the impression that you have visited the Greeks for the purpose of introducing another form of Christianity, or of establishing another Church, than that in which they have been nurtured.*" Those to Messrs. Roberston and Southgate, in 1840, are in substance the same. The following are brief extracts :

After alluding to the Oriental Churches as "having departed in some things from the purity of the Christian faith," and the "hostility of the Turks," the Instructions say, "in such cases it will not be expedient, or perhaps safe, directly to condemn or make opposition to erring Christians, or to the false religion." The Missionaries are told "to adhere steadfastly to the standards and institutions of their own Church," and yet "not directly to censure those Churches which make void the law of God through their traditions," and "not to attempt as having authority to banish and drive away false doctrine, because in a foreign country and without a Church under their pastoral care." As towards Mahometanism, nothing more aggressive is suggested than what follows :

"The disciples of Mahomet may with caution be reminded that most of what is reasonable and true in their religion is taken from the Christian's Bible. It may sometimes also be profitable to make known to the females especially, that it is the religion of Christ which exalts woman to that just rank and influence in society which the Author of nature and God of grace has designed that she should fill, and which contributes very much to the civilization of mankind"; and finally they are instructed "to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves."

It is to be said in justice to the reputed authors of these instructions, as also to the Foreign Committee of 1840, whose additional instructions have been still more seriously criticised—1st, that they were shaped almost wholly at the suggestion of the returned Missionary Agents, who caused themselves to be instructed just as they wished to be instructed; and 2d, that the work was new, information very imperfect, and few could then have well anticipated the results which followed, though some did anticipate them. The original mistake of those who wrote or dictated the Instructions, was in supposing that there was any difference, so

far as we are concerned, between Greeks and Roman Catholics, however they may wrangle about the “filioque” and the Pope’s supremacy.

The results of the principles upon which our Eastern Missions were started are now before us. I had the pleasure of hearing the missionary sermon of Mr. Southgate, before his first expedition, from the text, “*The rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee.*” According to his view, the Mahometans of Persia were these rams : he was going to look for them, and we, at his instance, undertook the remote and costly enterprise of bringing them into the fold. But Mr. Southgate, finding them intractable, fell back upon the Jacobites at Mardin, Mosul, &c., &c.; then upon the Greeks at Constantinople ; then was made a Bishop ; then was going to accomplish something great among the Armenians, (which was the special field of the American Board,) and all at his own instance. One of the most curious pieces of Missionary history extant is to be found in the annual reports of the Foreign Committee, following this Missionary. They consist of a series of dissolving views, while there was always a pregnant but mysterious future. The Missionary had ceased to be a “Missionary” (the name created a prejudice in the Greek mind) and had become an “Ambassador.” Flattering accounts were sent home. Something great was certainly to be accomplished, but it was not deemed prudent to divulge it. Slowly and reluctantly it came to be believed that there was nothing in it and never had been. The so-called Mission was a smoke in the nostrils of the Church. The Foreign Committee having previously refused to follow any further or even to obey the instructions of the Board, a report was presented first by a sub-committee (of which the Rev. Mr. Bedell was chairman) to the Foreign Committee, then by this Committee to the Board. It is in 13 pages (*vide* Proceedings of 1852), with copious citations of facts and authorities, and is in substance as follows :

1. The Eastern Churches are “decayed” in the same way that the Church of *Rome* is decayed ; i. e., by false doctrine, idolatry, persecuting laws, and abandoned morals.

2. The Foreign Committee “have entertained but one view” of the ecclesiastical system for reforming these churches. It was impracticable and useless : “they are forced to conclude that it will prove, as it always has proved, a failure,” and “must be abandoned.”

3. The Committee next declare that they will not consent to renew, or even take charge of, another mission upon that principle.

4. The Church Missionary Society, where they have not withdrawn their missionaries altogether, have instructed them to proceed as with all others who are ignorant of the Gospel, and this at the suggestion of the Bishops of Madras and Jerusalem, and with the consent of the Archbishop and many of the Bishops of England and Ireland.

5. The Committee argue the solemn *obligation* of receiving to separate reformed congregations such converts as may come out from those churches. “Shall the rulers of the Church,” say the Committee, quoting the Church Missionary Society, “like the Scribes and Pharisees, be per-

mitted to shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither going in themselves, nor suffering others to go in. And when perishing sinners, under such pitiable circumstances, apply to an Episcopal Reformed Church, like our own, to be taken in, shall they be told 'Your clergy object, and we cannot help you.' Then should we be more guilty than they," &c.

6. The Committee say: "We cannot ignore the fact that the only missions to the Eastern Churches which have heretofore produced any spiritual results at all commensurate with reasonable expectations, are those of the A. B. C. F. M."

The Committee of the Board to whom this Report was referred, (Bishop Burgess, chairman,) reported that this able and comprehensive Report was deemed conclusive, and their report was *accepted*; so that the Board itself did in 1852 repudiate the *principle* now under consideration.* The Committee add: "The mission at Athens is not involved in the conclusions of that report, from its peculiarly educational character, and from the evident blessing which has attended it in its own sphere."

Whether the conduct of the school at Athens entitles it to this exception may be much better ascertained now than in 1852. That it seriously concerns the Church to ascertain it, is sufficiently evident from what passed at the late meeting of the Board. These Notes will form another and (unless their correctness upon any important question of fact shall be impugned) a final effort on my part to bring the truth to light. It was with very great reluctance that I undertook this investigation at first, knowing the party spirit which a publication of the facts would rouse. But this was little in comparison with the reluctance which I felt to raise the issues which the facts absolutely compel me to raise with the missionary resident at Athens, a gentleman whom I never saw (certainly never since he was a missionary), or never had any communication with, direct or indirect. It is also due to the missionary to say that the "instructions" were well calculated to lead to the course which he has pursued. A band of angels so instructed, if hoping to accomplish anything which would meet expectations at home, would need to pray "lead us not into temptation," for the instructions did also say that the missionaries must be true to their own Church.

If it be asked why these Notes refer so largely to an earlier date of the mission, I answer—

1st. That they begin, so far as the facts touching its conduct are concerned, at a time when it had been twelve years in operation.

* The enterprise was dismissed. Bishop Southgate, who had finally reached the conclusion that there was little in the services of the Greek Church to be reformed, and that we had as much to learn from them as they from us, came home. The process which had brought him to that conclusion had cost the Church some \$70,000 or \$80,000. Dr. Robertson also returned, of the quality of whose labors and their results I have no desire to speak.

2d. That they are the result of the only real investigation which has ever been made.

3d. And especially because Dr. Hill and the Foreign Committee in all their reports affirm that the system of religious teaching in the school has been uniform from the beginning; that what is taught *now* is what always *has been* taught. Therefore, if this be true (as I suspect it is substantially or the schools would not now be in existence), and we can make out with certainty what *has been* taught at *any* time, we make out what is taught *now*. But if this be not true, and any change has been introduced since the publications of 1842, or the more astounding ones of 1858, why is there not the manliness to say so? In point of fact there has been no change, as we shall see.

Early in 1841 there was an alarm among the Greek ecclesiastics that the doctrines of their Church were in danger from Protestant missionaries, and an order was passed making the use of "*the catechism*" taught in the native schools obligatory in the missionary schools. Much agitation was produced. I arrived in October of that year, first at the island of Syra, where the Church Missionary Society had a school under the care of the Rev. Mr. Hildner, who informed me that he had received the order, had refused to obey it, and if the Government persisted he should close the school and leave the country. His firmness, and perhaps the English protection which he was under, saved him (and as I hear to this day) from any complicity in teaching false doctrine. From Syra I proceeded to Athens, and at the invitation of Mrs. Hill (Mr. H. being then in this country) went to the mission house, where I continued during my stay, though I did not deem it proper to accept the hospitality of a missionary establishment as a gratuity. I had much pleasant intercourse with the family, administered the communion in their own house on the Lord's day, and preached for Mr. Leaves, Chaplain to the British Legation.

I had sufficient evidence, in the parlor, of the proficiency of the Greek girls in music, and doubted not their equal proficiency in other branches of education. But I was chiefly desirous of ascertaining the religious teaching and influence of the school. This was in the exclusive line of my enquiries in all the countries through which I passed—their religious condition—of which I made a report, hoping thereby to render some little and (as I then supposed) final service to Christianity.

I was taken to see the "Mission" Schools, as by a singular distinction they have since been called. They were, I believe, in two rooms, crowded with small children, much like our infant schools. That the catechism was taught in *these* schools I have never asserted, as Dr. Hill very well knows—the children were too young to use that book. But the school kept at the mission residence where the catechism *was* taught, and the one which is so popular in Greece, I did not see. But it was not necessary to invite visitors into it, as, being conducted in a foreign language, it would have been but a useless interruption. Nor could I learn at the mission house anything of the religious instruction of the

schools, except that its devotional exercises were conducted by one of the pupils, using the Greek Liturgy. In the house I met and conversed with Basiliades, the priest who then taught the catechism in the school. I also conversed with the celebrated "Elizabeth of Crete," and subsequently visited "the stable," of which so much has been said. It is not improbable that the building had been so used in the war.

I could but observe the embarrassment of the teachers upon my enquiries respecting the doctrinal and devotional conduct of the school. I saw the painfulness of their position, which I am well assured had cost them a struggle.

But it was none the less my duty to ascertain, if I could, what was the religion taught, and what the probable influence of the school upon the doctrinal and spiritual future of Greece. Hearing, on all sides, of the order to teach the catechism, and that our mission had complied while every other had refused, I procured a copy and a translation which I caused to be verified by Bambas, a member of the University, who was well acquainted with both languages.

Its doctrine of transubstantiation is as follows (p. 26): "The Eucharist is a mystery in which the believer partakes, under the form or kind of bread, the very body of Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life. * * * Moreover, every true christian ought to be informed that in this sublime mystery he does not receive simple bread or simple wine, but under the form or kind of this consecrated bread he partakes of the true body of Christ himself, which was offered on the cross, and so of the wine."

Its doctrine of saint and picture worship, as laid down at page 36, has already been given. (*Vide supra*, p. 6.) It is true a caution is interposed against "praying more and oftener" to saints and other images "than to God himself." But does this distinguish it from Romanism or relieve it from idolatry? In point of *fact* the worship is paid almost exclusively to the Virgin Mary and the saints, or rather to their pictures.

Such is the *doctrine* of worship which was taught in our Protestant Missionary School at Athens. I went to the churches to see its *forms*, where the scene surpassed anything which I had conceived from the representations of image worship among pagans. The long continued and rapid motions, candle in hand, before the pictures of Saints; the bowings, crossings and kissing of pictures, presented a spectacle of idol worship more gross than anything I had witnessed in the Romish Churches of Southern Europe. I learned, moreover, that the girls educated in the schools, and reported to us as converts, continued as zealous worshippers of the Virgin and pictures as before. The further I enquired the more clearly I ascertained that no resident of Athens, native or foreign, supposed there was any influence exerted by the school which at all endangered the Greek faith or worship. I thought it my duty to publish the results of my enquiries. The correctness of my statement was impugned in private letters from Mr. Hill to the Foreign

Committee, but it was in a general way. A Mr. Masson also, brother-in-law to Mr. H. (who, in one of his defences of the Greek Church, said it was "vigorously Protestant and evangelical"), wrote an elaborate contradiction, which was shown me after my return by the then Secretary, Dr. Vaughn. I asked Dr. V. whether he believed what the letter said. He made no direct reply; when I remarked that if the Committee did believe it, they owed to Mr. Hill and to the Church, and not less to *themselves*, to *publish* it. But it never appeared.

The sources of my information were called in question. So far as *persons* were concerned, they were Mr. Leaves (Mr. Hill's predecessor in the Chaplaincy, long resident in Athens and much esteemed for his piety), Mr. Hildner, Dr. Korek, Petrom Bey (one of the old patriots of the revolution), Rev. Mr. Benjamin* of the American Board, and Mr. G. A. Perdicaris, a native of Greece and then American Consul, and now a resident of this country and a member of our Church. I conversed also with Dr. King, but, perceiving some unfriendliness to Mr. Hill, I made no use of any information derived from him, though I have never had any reason to believe that what he said was untrue. The correctness of what I learned at Athens was further confirmed by foreign residents in other parts of the Levant who were well informed of matters in Greece, and not mere travellers who heard nothing and knew nothing

* If exception be taken to Mr. Benjamin simply on account of his connection with the American Board, allow me to mention a conversation which I had at Beyroot with another missionary of that Board, Rev. Dr. Thompson, author of "The Land and the Book." I said to him—"Do you not think that we, having an Episcopal form of government in common with these churches, would be more hopeful instruments for their reformation than you?" "My dear sir," he answered, "we have not got to that question yet, and I am afraid we never shall. Our effort, for so many years, has been to get these people to worship Jesus Christ instead of the Virgin Mary, saints and pictures, and keep them from lying, stealing, and cutting each other's throats." "But," said I, "suppose you *should* come to this question, would we not then have the advantages referred to?" "It is by no means certain," he replied, "and for this reason: these people do not look at that subject as you do. They hold many things which you and I both regard as abominations, which they would be much less willing to give up than Episcopacy. And where you would judge for them you give to Episcopacy a factitious *relative* importance, and naturally enough, as it has, with you, been brought into prominence by generations of controversy. Church government is with us an inferior question, and we tried and would still prefer, if there were any chance of success, to evangelize these churches without touching or changing anything which is simply ecclesiastical. And if you have facilities for the work which we have not—as possibly you may have—and will come and take it off our hands and *do it*, we will cheerfully give it up and never cease to thank you for it. I have no prejudice against the Episcopal Church," he continued; "the best exhibition of Christianity which I ever saw was in St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, under Dr. Bedell." This reminds me that it was Dr. Bedell who preached the sermon at my ordination, and in no part of my ministry have I more conscientiously endeavored to fulfill the charge then given me than in the whole matter now in hand, even as against those whose duty it was, more than mine, to sift it.

about the school except what Mr. Hill told them. There was no shadow of doubt about the facts. It was my painful duty to publish them, which I did over my initials, which were well known, giving the name of the catechism and translations of the idolatrous matter taught. In due course of mail the Foreign Committee were assured from Athens that I had been misinformed, was mistaken, &c., &c., and that nothing there had been done amiss. But all was in general terms. No specific statement of mine was specifically denied.*

But now it appears that in less than one month after my exposé was published in this country (which was not until the spring of 1842), but before Mr. Hill could have seen it, he himself published a letter in a newspaper in Athens, professing to the Greeks to have done far more in his school than I had ever charged him with doing, as we shall soon see, though the fact never came to light until 1858, *i. e.* not in this country, and it was not until a year or two later that I knew that it had been translated at Smyrna in December, 1845, and published in the London Record, of which Mr. Hill must have been informed, for it was in a controversy with Mr. Bracebridge that the fact came out.

The year after my publication, however, the Foreign Committee (from some cause or other, I know not what, for they continued to extol the Mission as highly as ever) cut down the appropriation from \$8,076 to \$6,600, and the next year to \$2,963, and avowed the purpose to continue this reduction until the school should be thrown upon its own resources—which, I doubt not, were ample at the time, as I was informed at the Mission House that the schools would go on though all appropriations should cease. The truth is that the “pay” or boarding school, which has been the great attraction of the Mission, was self-supporting at the time, and Mr. Hill was able, and has been for twenty years, to set the Board at defiance (if he failed to lead them), which he would have done at any moment if it had interfered with his policy.

From his representations, however, the annual appropriation was subsequently fixed at \$2,500, besides his personal salary of \$800.

So matters continued until March, 1858, when, in consequence of some disparaging contrast which a traveller had published, touching the popularity of other missions in Greece compared with Mr. Hill's, Mr. Kalipothake, the editor of a Greek newspaper, who had been educated in this country, explained the cause of Mr. Hill's great popularity with the Greeks—through policy, for good or evil, he had become their assistant and tool in teaching their own religion. This he proved by translations from the Greek Government journals, giving a full and circum-

* Perhaps this exception should be made: It was denied by the Foreign Committee, I suppose upon Mr. Hill's information, that “the catechism,” so called, was, or ever had been, taught in the “Mission” School. But this was a culpable evasion, for upon scrutiny it was found that in this denial the term “Mission” School was confined, without any explanation, to the school of little children who were too young to learn any catechism, or certainly the one taught at the school kept in Mr. Hill's house.

stantial account of the examination of the religious teachings of the school, ordered by the Synod; the *reasons* for the examination; the special points to be raised; and they were the very points which are vital to our present enquiry, which would have been settled for us as well as the Greeks long since, had there been on the part of the Board anything approaching the skill, fidelity and thoroughness which the Synod displayed in protecting the integrity of their corrupt system. Mr. Kalipothake further published (or rather forwarded for publication in this country) the Report of the Synod's Examining Committee, to which Report the Foreign Committee refer in their Report for 1843, though of the real significance of what they were reporting the Committee knew as little as could be. They say (page 64): "This led Mr. Hill to request of the Secretary of State an examination, in any way he might think proper, of the truth of the allegations against him, and it resulted in the appointment of an Ecclesiastical Commission by the Synod of the kingdom, *whose Report was perfectly satisfactory.*"

The Foreign Committee do not state what the point of the "allegations" against Mr. Hill was—perhaps they did not know—but it was this, as started by a party in Athens more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of their fathers, viz: That the Protestant religion was being taught in Mr. Hill's school. Neither do the Foreign Committee give the Report of the Synod's Examining Commission, which was as follows, taken from the *Athena (Journal)*, June 18, 1842:

"The Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs to Rev. Mr. Hill.—The Commission appointed by the Holy Synod of the kingdom to enquire into the instructions given in your establishment for the education of young females, have, on diligent investigation, found that instruction to be in accordance with the doctrine of the Oriental Church of Christ. This it has submitted to the Holy Synod and to the Minister. J. RIZOS."

The Foreign Committee also refer in the same Report (page 65) to what they call "The memorable testimony of forty-six distinguished individuals, parents and guardians of the pupils educated in the mission family," in further proof of Mr. Hill's great popularity, without however telling what the testimonial was. That testimonial was as follows:

"As members of the Eastern Church of Christ, sincerely zealous of the religion of our fathers, we have felt an inward satisfaction in observing how conscientiously you directed the religious instruction of our children from the sacred catechism of our Church, explained by clergymen of our own, educated in our own theological schools."

Yet Mr. Hill, as quoted by the Foreign Committee the very next year, says: "Our schools are conducted on the same independent principles that they ever were. Now, as was the case in the earlier period of our mission, *the Word of God is our only Book!*"

Are these excusable discrepancies? How is it possible that contradictions so gross and palpable should escape notice?

And now we come to the next document which Mr. Kalipothake translates from the *Athena Journal*, No. 909, April 15, 1842, which the

date shows to be subsequent by six months to the enquiries made by me in Athens. This is Mr. Hill's own letter, as follows:

" * * * I repeat that we have ever avoided the system of proselytism, and that our only design has been to contribute to the education, based on religion and morality, of the female sex; the religion being that of their parents; the morality that of the Gospel; avoiding all interference with the peculiar doctrines of the Oriental Church, and observing strict silence on the peculiar ones of our own. As regards religious education according to the creed of their fathers, 1. We have been careful to have always in our schools a Greek priest, who teaches sacred history and the Catechism of the Greek Church. Thus we have had J. Distometes, then J. Mavros, and subsequently D. Basilides, who still continues teaching in our schools. 2. The girls go regularly to church, both on Sundays and the great festival days. I appeal to the priest Agathangelos, who lately officiated in the Church of the Saviour, where they heard the Holy Liturgy during six years, and to the present officiating minister of the Church of St. Nicholas, did they ever see other Christians going more regularly and devoutly to the Church of God than these girls? 3. Within doors their worship is conducted, morning and evening, not by me nor by Mrs. Hill, but by a Christian Greek female, concerning whose religious creed the most audacious sycophant alone would venture to doubt. The prayers and creed are read, not from the Anglican Liturgy, but from the Synopsis or Horologium of the Greek Church. 4. At the appointed days of the year they are sent to the confession. They confess and partake of the holy sacrament. We had always and have as the confessor the Rev. E. Marmariatouris. Whether all this be true or not let the parents of the young females be asked, let all their teachers be asked, and also the priests who have administered and continue to administer to them the sacred offices of the Greek Church.

(Signed,)

"ATHENS, April 4, 1842."

J. H. HILL.

This somewhat roused the Foreign Committee, but all was quieted by the next communication from Athens. The Secretary published in few words that the letter quoted above "was not a genuine letter." But it WAS A GENUINE letter in every single point of importance, as Mr. Hill's own denial with the circumstances will sufficiently prove, even if other proofs were not so numerous and decisive. It appeared, upon examining his reply at the office, that Mr. Hill admits that he wrote the letter, but says he gave it to a native friend to be put into better Greek than he could command, and that this friend altered it without showing it to him. But Mr. Hill foresaw that the question would be at once asked why he did not, after seeing it in print, correct anything in it which was untrue. To this anticipated enquiry he replies, that there was much excitement in Athens and he did not deem it expedient. (I give his explanation from memory; if erroneous, the Foreign Committee have the means of correcting it.) *But why did not Mr. Hill tell what the alterations were?* There is but one single expression in the letter,

“audacious sycophant,” that bears the marks of interpolation. That is a phrase current among the Greeks, and may have been added. But can any man believe that in such a series of facts stated over his own name, and the truth or untruth of which was known to the parties named and to hundreds more in Athens, it would have been *possible* for Mr. Hill to have remained silent if they had not been true in every important particular? What then are we to think when we are simply told that this “was not a genuine letter”?

But there is still another witness, of whose published testimony no explanation has ever been attempted. Mrs. Hill wrote to Mr. Hill, then in this country, under date of June 3, 1841, (and this was six months before my visit,) and Mr. Hill published her letter in the New York Churchman of September 25th, following, as follows: “ * * * On Tuesday evening I was informed by the venerable Archbishop, the President of the Holy Council, that he intended to visit us on the following day. At nine o’clock A. M., he entered, attended by the Archimandrite Misael, Professor of Theology in the University of Otho, the Bishop of Phocis, one of the five Bishops of the Synod, and his usual number of attendant deacons. The Rev. Professor Misael called me aside and said he wished to examine the pupils in the sacred Catechism. This was to have been the lesson for the day, and my first class was not present. I did not wish to show any embarrassment, however, and accordingly I sent up my own Bible class, who had never been instructed by a Greek priest, *but by myself alone and by you.* The excellent Professor proceeded in his usual mild and winning way to examine them *in the doctrine and discipline of their Church from their sacred Catechism*, and continued the examination more than an hour. They all answered correctly and beautifully.” Of the Archbishop, when he left, the letter continues: “He told me he was perfectly satisfied that the Catechism was perfectly taught in our schools. You may be assured it was with no common feeling of veneration and affection that I bent over and kissed the hand of the head of the Church in Greece.”

Such was the position of matters when the Board met in Baltimore in 1858, when I made a statement of some of the leading facts recited in these Notes, and where, according to Judge Chambers, at the late meeting of the Board, I was “thoroughly discomfited.” We shall see. In my argument to prove that no appropriations were necessary to keep up the establishment at Athens, I said that the style of living there was reported to be “magnificent.” I meant, as I should then have explained, in comparison with the general and great poverty of the Greeks, and not as compared with similar establishments in this country, or the style in which many city clergymen live here. But the house and its appointments *did* exceed anything in Athens at that time except that of the King. Allow me to be the more particular upon this point, as it is the only one on which I have been specifically contradicted on a question of fact.

An agent of the United States Government, sent to Athens in 1855,

wrote, upon his return, in reply to a letter from a prominent member of the Board, stating among other things that "Dr. Hill was a man of great cleverness, but much secularized in his habits and manners; that he dined with him; that his table was luxurious, with music, the best quality of cigars and various kinds of wines; his house was next to the King's palace"—*i. e.* in sumptuousness. "The establishment is looked upon by intelligent Greeks as a burlesque upon missions. They treated the idea of changing the *customs*"—what we call corruptions—"as perfectly absurd." The reader must judge how far out of the way the original statement was upon this point so immaterial to the main question. However, it was contradicted in the Board, at Baltimore, by the Rev. Dr. Stevens, whose visit was subsequent to mine, and who depicted, in strong colors, to the Board the great work which the schools had accomplished for Greece. But all was in general terms as received from Dr. Hill himself, without any specific denial about the doctrinal teaching in the school. "The mothers of Greece" was then, as since, the principal topic, without any knowledge either given by the speakers or possessed by the Board as to the religious system in which these mothers were trained.

Dr. Stevens was followed by Bishop Delancy, who pronounced the mission at Athens "no mission at all," and nothing more than a flourishing, self-supporting female boarding-school, and he earnestly dissuaded the Board from continuing to have any connection with it.

Another Bishop, who has always taken a prominent part in the business of the Board, said that he was of the same opinion respecting the mission as he had long been, and threw the whole responsibility of its further support upon Drs. Tyng and Stevens, the two most recent visitors.*

Soon after the adjournment of the Board I published, in the Episcopal Recorder, Nov. 27, 1858, an elaborate re-statement of the facts, arguments and proofs, substantiating the entire position taken in the Board (saving the trifle already excepted, so far as it is to be excepted, and which stood the supporters of the mission in such stead), which I conceived due to the Church, as it also gave opportunity to any responsible person to come

* The statement of Judge Chambers before the Board in 1865, respecting the issue at Baltimore in 1858, is wholly contrary to the facts. Not a single statement there made by me was disproved, with the trifling exception above noticed, of which the reader can judge. The issue was precisely upon the points contained in these Notes. Let Judge Chambers "discomfit" the author upon them *now*, if he can, or point to any publication or writing which people can read and judge of for themselves, in which it has been done; or else, for his own sake, cease from such statements. But Judge Chambers is a strong party man. The fact was that not I, but the *search for truth* at that time, as since, was "discomfited" by a "brilliant speech" about "the mothers of Greece." It is dangerous ever for jurors to come to a decision at the close of a brilliant speech. The facts, moreover, were new and startling to the Board. They *remained*, however, and upon a year's reflection the Committee of Investigation, refused in 1858, was voted by a large majority.

out with specific counter-proofs, if there were any, and put his name to them. The editor also invited such reply. But none ever appeared, and, so far as I know, every supporter of the mission has shrunk from a discussion of its merits in this form. Their strength lay in drawing glowing pictures to the Board, *viva voce*, of "the mothers of Greece," of whom the Board has heard so much and knows so little, fortifying themselves, perhaps, with a new opinion from some new traveller, every one of whom had received their information from the one source—Dr. Hill.

The Board met in 1859, and the annual eulogium upon the Mission was repeated. I supposed I had done with the subject, but Bishop Delaney, with whom I had had no conference upon the subject, moved the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That a special Committee of five be appointed to report to the Board, at its next meeting, upon the Greek Mission in all its bearings and relations as a Mission of this Church." It was carried by a large majority. "The Bishop of Western New York, Dr. Muhlenberg, Dr. Andrews, C. G. Memminger and S. H. Huntington were appointed the Committee." I objected to serving, for very obvious reasons, but was overruled. The Committee met and appointed Bishop Delaney and myself a sub-committee to procure information. But the Committee encountered every hindrance in their work from the start. The Foreign Committee refused any aid. The Committee had no personal acquaintance at Athens, and therefore prepared a series of questions to Dr. Hill himself, so framed as to draw from him, if possible, a specific admission or denial of the facts which had been alleged in the Board, and with which he was well acquainted. But they were completely foiled, whether fairly or unfairly the reader will soon have an opportunity of judging.

The Chairman also addressed a letter to the Minister of Public Instruction in Greece. No answer had been received up to October, 1860, and I, for one, was satisfied that no answer would be returned; at any rate, none in which Dr. Hill would not have a hand. The questions were sent to the Foreign Committee, with a polite request to forward them, which was refused, and the questions sent back to Bishop Delaney, who finally forwarded them through the State Department at Washington to the American Consul at Athens. They were long detained there, and the answers did not reach the Chairman until the last day of August, and then through the Foreign Committee, who, before sending them, first took copies for their own and others' use. The "Notes" came straggling in from the 13th of September until the 2d of October. And these were followed by "An Appeal" from Dr. Hill, which was privately circulated, in lithograph, among the members of the Board, a copy of which I only saw by accident when on the way to New Haven. This "appeal" contains several unworthy insinuations intended to discredit the impartiality of the member at whose instance he seems to have supposed the special Committee was raised. He also adventures this positive statement, that "Dr. Andrews had avowed his purpose to destroy the Mission." It is needless to say no man ever heard the

author avow any such purpose. I was only amazed that the Foreign Committee should avow *their* purpose to drop such a work, as this was represented to be, at Dr. Hill's death. My plan was to *reform* the Mission, and then continue it if the Greeks would permit.*

Dr. Hill also states in this appeal that this investigation is "annoying, vexatious and unnecessary;" and further, "had I consulted my personal feelings after the perusal of the questions submitted to me, I should have returned the document under a blank envelope and forwarded my resignation at the same time." "It was of little concern to him personally whether the mission was continued or not." Also, as follows, in accounting for his acceptance and success: "It has in part, also, been owing to the circumstance of our living under a remarkably free Government, and *in the midst of a most liberal, generous and enlightened people. Indeed, I know not a people under the sun professing Christianity, so liberal, so generous, so free from bigotry, as the people of free Greece.*" Astonishing as it might be supposed this would seem to the Board, it is by no means the whole of Dr. Hill's mind with respect to the Greeks—a fact which might have been brought out at any time within the past twenty years, had his will or policy been crossed.

But we must come to the Questions, and if the reader wishes to form any proper judgment, he is requested to *read and compare them with the Answers carefully for himself*, whether any comment be offered or not, since it was *these* answers to *these* questions which were pronounced the "triumphant vindication" at New Haven. There will be observed in them several references to "Notes." These Notes were before the Committee in MSS., and so far as the Committee read them at its single brief session, (which was all they were able to hold before the Board met,) they were more unsatisfactory and evasive than the Answers themselves. They have never been printed, so far as I know, and they can be printed still if his supporters desire it; but it is hardly conceivable that they should contain anything to alter the result. The Answers were presumed to be the main defence, for they only were submitted to the Board.

The Questions of the Special Committee will be first given *verbatim*, then Dr. Hill's answer, then the facts or remarks suggested. The reader will perceive where the facts contradict the Answers, and where they are supplementary or gathered from other sources, in answer to the Committee's questions.

* The ground taken by Bishop Delancy was, in his own words: "The mission at Athens is no mission at all; besides we have no call to send missionaries to the Greek Church, or the Roman Catholic Church, or the Presbyterian Church, but to the heathen." It seemed to me that our call was to preach the Gospel to every creature who would hear it; but taken as a practical question, it is probable he was right, for certainly thus far there has been no opening for our missionaries to preach the Gospel to any but the heathen, and in point of fact it never has been preached to any but the heathen. Whether Bishop Delancy ever objected to the principle of the "instructions," or to the system pursued at Athens, I am not informed.

It had been stated in the Board by several speakers that the advantages of the school were chiefly of a literary character, and that the necessities of Greece were not such as to call upon a Missionary Society for charitable appropriations for that purpose. The first five questions were intended to bring out such facts as would enable the Board to judge whether this was so or not.

Question 1. What was the population of Athens in 1840, and what is it now? (1859.)

Ans. 1. The population of Athens in 1840 was probably about 30,000 (no census); at present there are somewhere about 45,000 inhabitants.

Facts. As given in Colton's Atlas the population of Athens was, in 1852, 28,000, and in all Greece 1,002,102.

It having been asserted in the Board that the means of Education were already abundant in Greece, the four following questions were intended to ascertain the facts:

Ques. 2. What proportion of the children of both sexes at the age of 14 can read?

Ans. 2. Of the middling and higher classes, children of both sexes at the age of fourteen have all, or nearly all, learned to read; of the lower classes, perhaps not more than one in ten.

Ques. 3. How many of the youth are in Colleges or other schools further advanced than our common schools?

Ans. 3. In the University of Otho, the only one in Greece, there are now 500 students. In the two High Schools there are 550 boys. A large proportion of these students and pupils come from abroad, beyond the limits of free Greece; and another large proportion from the provinces of free Greece.

Ques. 4. Are there any boarding or other schools in Athens for girls of a more advanced grade than our common schools, which are conducted by Greeks, and if so, how many pupils in each?

Ans. 4. There are now existing in Athens three boarding schools for girls: the principal one is that of the Philekpaideutic Society, supported by annual subscriptions of its members. It has 80 boarders who pay for their education and a few who are received as free pupils. They have also a day school of 300 scholars who pay for their schooling. Another boarding school for girls was established two years ago by Mr. and Mrs. Sourmelis, Greeks—it is entirely a private enterprise and upon a small scale. They have 20 boarders, and there is a school for day scholars who pay for their schooling from \$1 to \$4 a month. Another boarding school has lately been opened by Mr. and Mrs. Siotis, friends of ours—but upon a very limited scale, and its success is very doubtful as they have not the means of carrying it on to any extent. They have at present only 6 or 8 girls boarders—with a paying day school of 52.

Ques. 5. Are there any free schools in Athens, and if not, at what rate can a common school education be obtained?

Ans. 5. There are no free schools in Athens, nor throughout the kingdom of Greece, with the exception of our Mission Schools, and those of the Church Missionary Society in Syra, under the care of the Rev. F. A. Hildner. The Demos of Athens has established two Common Schools containing 350 girls: each pupil is obliged to pay a *didansvor*, which varies from 50 to 90 cents, per month.

Facts—As taken from an Athens newspaper, published in 1858, and from Baird's Modern Greece, published in 1856. His statistics were

procured from a manuscript paper on the State of Education in Greece, from the Bureau of Public Instruction. From the paper published in 1858, as follows:

SCHOOLS.	NUMBER.	Professors and Teachers.	Number of Scholars.	Am't exp'd upon them by Gov't in drachms (six to a dollar).
University (of Otho).....	1	45	495	160,000
Gymnasia.....	7	50	1,124	200,000
Hellenic (classical).....	79	142	5,342	260,000
Government Schools for teachers	Not stated.	8	145	17,500
Common Schools.....	458	533	42,353	115,000
Private institutions (stated to be sustained by tuition fees :				
Of middle grade	12	50	718	
do female	10	...	900	
Common schools for boys and girls.....	32	42	2,880	
	599	870	53,957	752,500

Whether these private schools include the two mission schools is not stated.

In this small population Mr. Baird says, "This University has as many students and twice as large a corps of professors as our largest colleges." The library has 70,000 volumes. The Government schools, if not free are so nearly so that Mr. Baird says: "It may be affirmed with confidence that none need be deprived of a respectable education, save in consequence of their own willfulness and idleness."

The 6th and 7th questions were proposed in consequence of its having been stated in the Board that it was impossible, according to the laws of Greece, to make any innovation upon their doctrines or worship, except by stealth.

Ques. 6. What were the laws of Greece in 1841, which in any way bore upon Missionary work—such, *e. g.*, as proselyting and books for religious instruction to be used?

Ans. 6. In 1834, under the Bavarian Regency, a law regarding Public Instruction was promulgated—and that law was in force in 1841—and is still in force and has never been altered to the best of my knowledge. It was then (in answer to this enquiry) the only "Law in 1841 which in any way bore upon Missionary work." It was drawn up by the Rev. Dr. C. L. Korek, a clergyman in English Orders, but a German protestant of Bremen; for many years a Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in Syra, and the founder of the Missionary Schools there which still exist under the care of the Rev. Mr. Hildner. This law is a translation of the law existing in Prussia on the subject of Public Instruction. It contains not an article or phrase which can possibly be construed as interfering with the judicious pursuance of any Missionary work by Protestants. It makes no mention of proselyting. Among the books of instruction pointed out, the HOLY SCRIPTURES in the modern tongue stand at the head of the list.

Ques. 7. Have these laws been changed, and if so, when and in what respect?

Ans. 7. The "Law regarding Public Instruction," referred to in the preceding article, is that under which all the schools in the kingdom are conducted, including our own; and, as I have already stated, it has never been altered or modified in any way, to the best of my knowledge. (Sec Note.)

The fact, as found in "Greece as a Kingdom," by Frederick Strong, Bavarian Consul at Athens, and published in 1842, and dedicated by express permission to the King, page 354 :

Extract from the Declaration of Independence of the Greek Church, beginning, "Otho, by the grace of God, King of Greece," which is declared to be a part of the fundamental law of the kingdom :—"The Synod has to watch over the preservation of the purity of the Articles of Faith, received and acknowledged by the Oriental Church, and especially of the books treating on religious subjects, intended for the perusal of the clergy or of young persons; and as soon as it is ascertained that any one attempts to make innovations upon the Church of the kingdom, either by *new doctrines, proselytism*, or in any other manner, it is bound to require the aid of the temporal authorities to suppress the evil. The Synod further keeps a vigilant eye upon the punctual observance of the ecclesiastical customs and regulations and the sacred rites and ceremonies, and everything else belonging to the public worship." Given at Nauplia, (then the capital,) July 23, 1833, in the name of the King, regency, and Secretaries, whose names are appended.

Mr. Strong adds, also, under the head of "Missionaries," this same year (1842): "There are several agents of British and missionary societies at Athens, Argos, Syra, &c., but their labors are chiefly confined to distributing tracts and establishing schools, all attempts at proselyting being strictly prohibited by the laws." (p. 367.)

Ques. 8. Has the Gospel, as the P. E. Church of the United States receives the same, (Vide Articles 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 32) been at any time publicly preached by any of our Missionaries in Greece? If not,

Ques. 9. Has the same at any time, or is it now, privately taught in the "pay" or "Missionary" schools, so that the differences between our Church and the Greek Church are understood by the persons taught?

Ans. 8. & 9. In all the instructions and teachings of our Missionaries—in every department under their care, both in public and private—at home and abroad—in the house and by the way—to pupils of every class, and to all persons coming within the range of their influence, they have never shunned to declare and to maintain the truths of the everlasting Gospel, as they have themselves been taught of God, and as they have received those truths from the Word of God. (Art. 6 of C. P. Book.) The Evangelical doctrines as set forth in the several "Articles of Religion" enumerated in the 8th question, have been clearly taught and publicly taught according to the ability which God has given me. It follows therefore that the differences between "our Church and the Greek Church, on all Scriptural truths necessary to salvation," are perfectly understood by the persons taught, who are of an age to understand them.

Facts. 1. The missionary has never preached to Greeks in their language. For remainder bearing upon these answers, see preceding Notes, especially Dr. Hill's own letter of April 4th, 1842!

Ques. 10. Has the Greek Government or Church at any time interfered in the religious instruction of the schools, and if so, in what way?

Ans. 10. There has been no "interference" of any kind, either "on the part of the Greek Government, or the Greek Church, with regard to the religious instruction *in* (not 'of') the schools," under my care. On the contrary, we have

ever been regarded (and never more so than at the present day) as the benefactors of the present generation, or the pioneers of an enlightened education, spiritual and moral, as well as intellectual. The proofs of this are coeval with the history of our Mission, and are quite too voluminous to be introduced in a communication of this kind.

Ques. 11. Has the religious instruction of any of the schools, or any part of it, been at any time conducted by Greek Ecclesiastics—and if so, in what year did such instruction begin, and in what year did it end?

Ans. 11. The religious instruction in the Missionary Schools under my care has never been conducted by Greek Ecclesiastics, “nor any part of it.” (See an important Note on this answer.)

Facts.—See Dr. and Mrs. Hill’s letters, already quoted. Also Spirit of Missions for October, 1842. “The Greek authorities have insisted, as they have a perfect right to do, that a Greek Catechism be taught in all schools, and such has been done in the Mission Schools by a Greek ecclesiastic.”

A year afterward, the Secretary explains that the word “Mission” should not have been inserted. But what trifling is this. It was confessedly enforced and taught in the *other* schools, which were then first excepted from the name of “Mission” Schools, apparently to meet this difficulty. No one had ever said that the Catechism was taught to the little children who were too young to learn it, in what are now called “Mission” Schools, and, in order to prevent evasion, the question was made to read “in *any* of the schools,” &c. The answer is before the reader. Dr. H. refers to an “important note.” What the note contains I do not know (as already explained), nor is it of any consequence, for the facts are beyond dispute and on so many independent grounds that no “note” can make any difference. It was these questions and answers, and these alone, which were printed for the information of the Board at its meeting in 1860, and the answers pronounced “a triumphant vindication,” &c.

Ques. 12. Have any Greek catechisms been taught in any of the schools—and if so, what were the titles of such catechisms, and in which of the schools were they taught, and by whom; and when did such teaching begin and when did it end in each school? Please to specify the year.

Ans. 12. I apprehend that much of the confusion, and I may say of the vain discussions that have taken place at home on the subject of a Greek Catechism, have arisen from ignorance of the fact that, strictly speaking, and as the word is universally understood, I suppose, by our Church, there exists no such thing as a Church Catechism in the Greek Church. No such “form of religious instruction” has ever been set forth or recognized. Our “Church Catechism” is called “an instruction to be learned of every person,” &c., &c.; and it is obligatory, as such, upon all ministers of parishes, and heads of families, and sponsors in baptism, to see that it be taught. But the Greek Church, as I have said, recognizes no such form of religious instruction. Private individuals, however, without any official authority, have prepared various Catechisms, religious as well as others, including Botany, Astronomy, Geology, &c., and these have served a good purpose for the emergency (just as our Book of Homilies was useful in an age of ignorance). It will be admitted, I hope, that *some* system of religious instruction should be adopted in our teaching. What

should we have? Extemporaneous, oral instruction? We did not neglect that. Day after day, "in season and out of season," we taught our pupils—"catechised" them, "gave them religious instruction". But extemporaneous explanations, and especially on religious subjects, are not always safe; else why have we written discourses? why have we a Liturgy? We were very glad, therefore, to have it in our power to avail ourselves of an admirable "Treatise or Compendium of Christian Doctrine," by the Most Reverend and learned Metropolitan of Moscow, Archbishop Platoff (1770), as it accorded in the important doctrines contained in the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, with the common consent of every Orthodox Church. Of these, then, together with the beautiful, orthodox, spiritual, evangelical explanations of the pious Prelate above named, we made use in our teaching, as occasion served. *Nothing beyond these* was or ever has been taught by myself, or has ever been allowed to be taught by others, whether wearing an ecclesiastical garb, a female costume, or a layman's frock; and to the honor and praise of the liberality of the Greek Church and the Greek community, by far the most liberal, generous and confiding Church and community that I am acquainted with in any part of Christendom, nothing beyond this has ever been required or expected from us. (See Note for further remarks on this point.) My reply, then, to the 12th question, after this preliminary explanation, is just this: *The Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue, and the nature, necessity and importance of the two Sacraments* were thoroughly taught to all our pupils, using as a basis the so-called "Compendium of Christian Doctrine" of Archbishop Platoff, so highly *extolled and recommended* by the *Missionaries of the American Board*. As we hold all these matters in common with the Ancient Church, *we* could have no hesitation in teaching them ourselves or allowing them to be taught, under our supervision, by persons who thoroughly possessed our confidence.

From 1834 to 1842 we had confided to our care, by the Greek Government, a number of young girls, whom we engaged to train as teachers of female schools in the Provinces—the most important work we ever undertook, and the nucleus of all female education in this land. We thought it immensely important that they should be well instructed in the fundamental articles of the P. E. faith before they left our roof; and these were so "catechised," *i. e.* orally taught, by ourselves and, under our immediate supervision, by our intelligent and enlightened pupil, "Elizabeth of Crete," who had been a member of our Mission family since 1831. She had the Catechetical lesson in 1839 and 1840, at which period the more advanced pupils of our charge were entering upon their course of religious instruction in a more systematic manner. This continued for the space of two years. During my absence (in 1841) of eight months (and it was then that the Rev. C. W. Andrews paid his brief visit to Athens), this duty was confided to one of our teachers—one of those humble-minded, simple-minded professional teachers of whom I have spoken in my note to the preceding answer. I understand perfectly well in what manner and for what reason this very innocent and perfectly justifiable arrangement has been distorted into the alarming category of "the Greek Catechism being taught in the Mission schools of Dr. Hill by a Greek Priest!" (See note for further remarks under this head.) In answer to the enquiry, "in which of the schools?" in addition to what I have written above, I have to say, that at that period (previous to 1842) a portion of our pupils were day scholars, and that portion (the pay school) was strictly, and with the full understanding of the Foreign Committee, a branch, and the most important one, of our Mission. To these also was the obnoxious catechism (as above explained) taught. "By whom?" Ans. As previously explained.

“When did it begin?” Ans. In 1836. “When did it end?” Ans. In 1842, when the whole of our beautiful structure was unhappily broken in upon by the intrigues of the authors of the celebrated, shameful anonymous letters of 1858. Mrs. Hill’s health gave way then under the load of vexation and disgust arising out of those shameful developments, and we never again resumed those labors.

Facts.—The Catechism taught in Dr. Hill’s principal school in 1842 was the Catechism of *D. N. Darbaris*, a copy of which is before me, with the following title page: “*Catechism, or the Orthodox Teachings of the Eastern Church, for the use of the Greek Youth; published with the approbation of the Holy Synod. Athens, 1837.*” The Introduction states that it was “translated from the Russian, about thirty years before, by the lamented *D. N. Darbaris*,” and that it “had been introduced into all the schools.” Translations from it have already been submitted. It had been publicly charged and printed in this country that “*Darbaris’* Catechism” was taught in our Mission Schools, with which fact no one was better acquainted than Dr. Hill. The Committee wished to know from him the *title* of that Catechism which the Foreign Committee say “the Synod had insisted on having taught, and which had been taught,” and of the Catechism which Dr. Hill, in his letter to the *Athena* newspaper calls “the Catechism of the Greek Church,” and which he said he had always been careful to have a Greek priest teach, and which Mrs. Hill, in her letter to her husband, calls “the sacred Catechism,” in which the pupils “answered so correctly” that the Archbishop “said he was perfectly satisfied that the Catechism was perfectly taught,” and whose report allayed the fears of the roused and suspicious Synod.

The Special Committee so framed the question that, as they supposed, Dr. Hill could not evade a direct answer. But it seems they failed; and there was no more important question on the list. We now hear for the first time of Plato’s Catechism—the only name which he gives in reply to our question. Does Dr. Hill mean to say that Plato’s work was the one so often and definitely referred to in their own communications made before any questions were asked. Let the reader judge from his answer.

But Plato’s work is no catechism at all—does not profess to be—but “A Synopsis of Christian Theology,” and is in 240 pages, 8vo. But suppose this to have been the book taught, if taught according to the intention of the Synod, Dr. Hill taught idolatry, as in sections V. and VI., Part III. I have no doubt that Plato was a truly pious, as he was a most accomplished man. So were the Jansenists, who bore much the same relation, doctrinally, to the Church of Rome which he bore to the Greek. But his Synopsis was not the book about which Dr. H. would have the Board believe there had been so much “vain discussion,” but *Darbaris’* Catechism, the very book meant and named in all the discussions had both here and in England.

Before proceeding further, let the reader turn back and re-peruse the preceding question and answer, and compare the answer with what follows, from the *Εφημερίς των φιλομαθων*, published in Athens, July 9, 1860. The questions of the Committee were still in Dr. Hill’s hands, and had been

for some months. It having been asserted, or the fear expressed, in another paper, (an exceedingly jealous friend of the school,) two days before, that the sacred Catechism (*η ιερα Κατηχησις*) was not taught in it, the editor of the journal first named, who had been ten years a teacher in Dr. Hill's school, replies: "The Catechism of the Eastern Orthodox Church is taught regularly in the school by the professor and holy monk, Mr. Jeremiah Kazakos, the one who gives in the Greek Seminary for females, and in the Orphan Asylum, and in the Royal Seminary for Teachers the same instruction, and that in all other things the duties required by the Eastern Church are put in practice, and the witnesses to this are the priests in the Church of the Saviour, and the conduct of those who return from that school to their families." If this statement had not been true, could it have been published in Athens without contradiction, when the priesthood and the principal citizens must have known it to be false?

At the close of this answer, Dr. Hill speaks of the "shameful anonymous letters of 1858." These letters were written by Dr. Kalipothake, an editor and publisher in Athens, and forwarded to a paper published in Richmond. They contained only facts of public notoriety in Athens, not one of which has been controverted. The most "shameful" part of them was the translating and sending of Dr. Hill's own letter, already cited. But how did Dr. H. treat the author—well known to him—whose work he so characterizes? Did he go to him with an indignant denial of what he had written? No; but with a smiling face, and with papers in his hands to employ him in printing. Indeed, he was so personally kind that Mr. K. was almost sorry that he had communicated the information.

I am absolutely compelled thus, by facts and circumstances, to cross-examine a witness on whose sole testimony the Board was called to act, and this, too, when, as it appears from the extract above given from the Greek journal, Dr. H., at the very time he was writing this answer, had "the professor and holy monk, Jeremiah Kazakos," teaching the Greek Catechism in his school.

I here introduce the 17th question as relevant to the preceding:

Question 17. Had the teaching of the doctrines of the Protestant Faith any agency in closing the schools taught by Mr. Leyburn at Areopolis? if so, how does it happen that the schools taught at Athens, conducted by our Mission, were suffered to be continued?

Answer 17. "The teaching of the doctrines of the Protestant Faith" most assuredly had no "agency in closing the school taught by Mr. Leyburn" in Maina (not "Sparta"). The Greek Church received all the doctrines of the Protestant Faith, as contained in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, and even in the Articles of Religion, with the exception of those which are of a mere local or civil nature, and of one or two not essential to salvation. The teaching of those doctrines, therefore, could not give offence, and could not have "had any agency in closing Mr. Leyburn's school." The difficulties about that little school arose from quite another source with which I have nothing to do. They were not closed by authority, but were voluntarily abandoned, (if I mistake not,) a step which was greatly regretted by all sober-

mind Greek in that distant province, by whom it was considered unnecessary, as it removed a pious evangelical teacher from a very destitute part of Greece, where it was not likely any second effort would be made.

"The schools at Athens were suffered to be continued," (notwithstanding Mr. Leyburn's abandonment of his post,) simply because no cause existed for closing them. We were not called upon by any person, or by any circumstances from within or from without, to abandon our work, and so we "were suffered to continue them," because no man forbade us. We were neither magnanimous enough, nor sympathetic enough to follow that very small example in Maina, and to abandon voluntarily our own mighty work, which at that very period was at its acme, after a toil and labor of eleven years. "Should I have done well to be angry for (Mr. Leyburn's) withered gourd?" And in my foolish displeasure "have gone out of this great city, wherein were so many who could not discern between their right hand and their left hand?" (Jonah, e. 4.) I trust my sound Church friends will forgive me for continuing my work then, and ever since; although I have good reasons for supposing that some others were greatly disappointed, at the time, both here and in our own country. (See note.)

The *truth* was that Mr. Leyburn's school was broken up by the Government because he would not teach Darbaris' Catechism, and Dr. Hill was suffered to continue because he *did* teach it,—facts which Dr. Hill perfectly well knew, as he also as well knew what the committee wanted. I am unwilling to make any remarks upon this answer, so characteristic of the whole series, but simply relate the facts.

At the instance of another member of the committee, I addressed a letter to Mr. Leyburn, whom I knew only by character, asking a statement of the causes which led to the suppression of his school, and received his answer six months before the arrival of Dr. Hill's answer from Greece. Mr. L. says: "As to the subject of your enquiry, I can only say that our schools at Areopolis were obliged to be surrendered to the Government because of our not being willing to introduce Darbaris' Catechism, and that the Episcopal Mission Schools at Athens did continue in existence, the catechism being used in them. As to the why, in regard to the latter, you can judge as well as I. I simply state the facts. When I went to Athens after the breaking up of the schools and station, I was treated with rather marked, and as it seemed to me, extraordinary deference, on the part of the officers of the Department of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs, the very persons who had been the organs of the Government in the action against us. In a conversation with Mr. Rizos, who was acting head of this department, he expressed his surprise that we had made objection, since Mr. Hill had received the catechism without opposing any difficulty."

If Mr. Leyburn's testimony—which, aside from his own character, bears every internal mark of truthfulness—needs to be corroborated, take that of Mr. G. A. Perdicaris, whose work upon Greece was published in 1845. Mr. P. being American Consul at the time, old Petrom Bey (a great patriot and a great friend of all the schools—Mr. Hill's included—and who, as I judged, did not care personally what catechism was taught, or whether any), hearing of the order sent to Mr. Leyburn, went to Mr. P. to engage him to go to Areopolis and endeavor, if possible, to

save so useful an establishment, educating two hundred children. Mr. P. went, and upon enquiring what could be done, Mr. L. said: "The order from Government is, either to teach the Catechism or allow a priest to teach it. As to teaching it myself, that is, of course, impossible; and if I allow the priest to teach it, I must, in private, seek to counteract his teaching, in which case I must be false to the Government; or I must let it pass with my apparent sanction, in which case I shall be false to my own conscience, to the Protestant Church, and to the Society which sustains me here." Mr. Perdicaris' reply was: "I have no more to say. The school must go." As the event was a memorable one in the history of Missions, Mr. P. alludes to it in his work upon Greece (vol. 2, p. 135), as follows. After speaking of the enforcement of the law which required the teaching of the Catechism—"It was at first thought that Mr. Leyburn, like Mr. Hill, would not refuse his compliance in a matter of mere form, but Mr. L. had not remained long enough in Athens to learn the subtle equivocations of diplomacy, and therefore could not and would not submit to the alternative of being found wanting in the honest performance of his promises, or acting in opposition to the dictates of his conscience. The proposition of the Secretary was plain; it enjoined what could not be complied with without a sacrifice of conscience, and Mr. Leyburn closed his school and his career in Mane, as he commenced it, with the honor and dignity which becomes the character of a man and a christian."

What is to be thought of such an answer to such a question, in view of Dr. Hill's familiarity with all the facts?

Ques. 13. If the Greek catechisms referred to have at any time been taught, please quote from them the original, with a translation annexed, the principal matters in which they differ from our own standards.

Ans. 13. As this is not a question, but a request (founded on a supposed affirmative reply to the foregoing), no further answer is necessary than a reference to the preceding. The request will be seen to be superfluous after the explanations in my answer to the 12th question.

The reader is requested to turn back and see whether this request has been complied with, or met in any way.

Ques. 14. Have the schools produced any change in the doctrinal belief of those educated in them, so as to warrant the belief that they will undermine the doctrinal errors and superstitions of the Greek Church?

Ans. 14. I am happy to be able to affirm, and that, too, conscientiously, that a very marked improvement has been produced upon hundreds and hundreds of those who have come under our influence, with respect to all those doctrinal errors and superstitions which still exist to a lamentable degree among a large portion of the members of the Greek Church. Hence the chiefest necessity and the strongest argument for the continuance of the Mission.

While we observe with pleasure that great changes have taken place with regard to all superstitious reverence for external observances and unessential matters connected with their religion, which, thirty years ago, was considered by them all-important, we can testify, with still greater satisfaction, to the gradual and steady progress amongst that portion of the Greek community over which we may be presumed to have some influence, of a more spiritual state of

feeling. Of this we have many proofs at hand, but this is not the place to introduce it. I may throw them into a note under this head.

Ques. 15. The chief argument in favor of the schools, in this country, being that their tendency is to bring the Greeks to embrace the Protestant religion, as held by our Church, would it endanger the continuance of the schools if it were understood by the Greeks that this was the purpose and expectation of their friends?

The answer to this seems to be given in what Dr. Hill calls his reply to the second paragraph of the 14th question, as follows:

“With regard to the second paragraph of this 14th question [wherein it is formally stated and taken for granted that the ‘chief argument in favor of the schools, in this country (the United States), is that their tendency is to bring the Greeks to embrace the Protestant religion as held by our Church’—and then follows the question, upon this ‘*petitio principii*,’ whether a declaration of this being ‘the purpose and expectation of its friends would endanger the continuance of the schools’]—I would, in reply, respectfully submit to the Special Committee, that, in the instructions under which my colleagues and myself were appointed in 1830, I recognize no such ‘purpose or expectation,’ but I do perceive therein quite a different view of the objects of this Mission. Accordingly, I have never attempted to make the Greeks understand that ‘the tendency of the schools is to bring the Greeks to embrace the Protestant religion as held by our Church’—(language of the second paragraph of the 14th question).

“I do not conceive that I am called upon to pronounce any opinion upon the question addressed to me ‘whether a declaration to that effect would endanger the continuance of the schools.’ The objects of this Mission, as I apprehend them to be set forth in our instructions, were, without removing one stone from the edifice of this venerable Church, to endeavor to fashion living stones for the spiritual house, spoken of by St. Peter—1st Ep.: 2d, 4th, 5th. Of such we believe there are many who will acknowledge, in the great day of manifestation, that they owe their place in the Upper Temple to the teachings of your Missionaries in Athens, under God. The instructions I received from the Church, on my departure in 1830, have never been altered. I adopted them as the basis of my operations as a Missionary to this decayed branch of the Church of Christ. They recognize no object as that set forth in the second paragraph of the 4th question; but, on the contrary, I am instructed in very solemn language to be very careful not to undermine this Ancient Apostolic Church, but to endeavor to throw light within her borders—to prune and cleanse, not to uproot or undermine. *Vide* the Instructions of 1830.”

Weary of pursuing these answers we shall do little more, from this on, than to reprint both the questions and answers, and leave the reader to judge without comment, except where there are facts not likely to be generally known.

Ques. 16. Are the pupils in the schools, or in any of them, taught that the Greek Church is in error in any of its doctrines or worship—and if they are, please specify the errors which are brought to the attention of the pupils, and the directions which are given by the teachers to avoid them? Please name the teacher who points out these errors, and say whether it is done before the class or in private, and whether it is known by the parents or ecclesiastics at Athens that such teaching is had at the school.

The following answer is in the printed pamphlet erroneously numbered

15, and there are numerous errors in it of the same kind which increase the confusion and difficulty of understanding it :

Ans. 16. As the doctrines and worship of the Church of Greece are profess-
edly based upon the Word of God, we are never at a loss, in the course of our
teachings among our pupils, or in our discussions with others, when subjects
come up or questions arise upon which we differ. To the Scripture we refer
them. We unhesitatingly point out the error of doctrine or of practice—the
gloss—the abuse—the misrepresentation (or whatever it may be). Comparing
these with Scripture, or, if need be, with our primitive usage ; and this we en-
deavor to do as faithfully as we are appointed of God, but as discreetly as
becomes our position and our profession ; for we are enjoined by our “higher
instructions,” to combine meekness with wisdom ; “in meekness to instruct
them that oppose ;” “to give a reason for the hope that is in us, (in answering
those that ask us,) with meekness and fear” (not fear of man, but proper respect
for man, and humble reverence of God). And as, in the good providence of God,
we alone, among all the American Missionaries in this country, have a common
standard of faith with the Greeks, in our Creed, and a complete summary of
doctrine therein, acknowledged by both Churches—in the study of this and the
Lord’s prayer, and the decalogue, with the Holy Scriptures in our hands, (an
“open book” here and our ultima ratio—and “their own book” as they live to
tell us, “for they transmitted the N. T. to us”)—in all these, we have a suffi-
ciently wide field for religious instruction and for religious discussion, and for
controversy, too, if need be. To these things, then, we give our particular atten-
tion, endeavoring to enforce the spiritual and moral obligations growing out of
them, affectionately and seriously and prayerfully. I know of no better way to
make men and women Christians indeed, which is my only object here. The
orthodoxy of their Church government, I apprehend, we cannot dare to touch
without feeling a vibrating chord throughout our own system. It is quite a dif-
ferent matter with the missionaries of the American Board, who can have no
hesitation on this subject of course—and who (as we see) do not hesitate. For
further remarks growing out of this 16th question, and my reply, I refer the
Special Committee to my note in the Appendix.

The question calls for specific errors, but all is avoided in generalities. Yet Dr. Hill writes to Bishop Delancy in a letter enclosing his
answers, as follows :

“As the committee state in the preamble to their interrogatories that they
were designed “to bear upon the history and conduct of the Greek Mission,”
I have in my answers endeavored to supply them with materials to assist them
in these respects ; and I was obliged to fill up the imperfections of their ques-
tions with the copiousness of my answers. * * * I have supposed
the Special Committee to be really desirous of acquiring all the information
which it was in my power to give ; and I have kept back nothing. On the con-
trary, whenever I have supposed the question to be purposely designed to elicit
details, or whenever I have found them so imperfectly expressed as to need
something of more importance than a mere literal reply would afford, I have not
spared time nor space to gratify the committee.”

(Question 17 and answer previously given.)

Ques. 18. Has any enquiry or examination at any time been made on the sub-
ject by the Greek Government or Greek Ecclesiasties, and if so, what was the
report made ? Was anything reported or said tending to show why the schools
at Athens should be continued ? and if so, please annex a copy of any such report
or statement.

The Report asked for was that of Mr. Rizos, to which the Foreign Committee had referred in the Spirit of Missions, though it does not appear that they had ever seen it. It was first published in this country in 1858. Two copies of it had been forwarded to Dr. Hill, when he gave the following answer to the foregoing question—(the answer which he erroneously numbers 17, it will be perceived, is part of his reply to question 18):

Ans. 17. If this question refers to Mr. Leyburn's affair—as the phrase, “this subject,” immediately following the subject of enquiry in the preceding question would imply—I must say I never heard of any “enquiry or examination by the Greek Government or Greek Ecclesiasties,” either then or at any subsequent period. (See note.)

Ans. 18. Neither is this question very clear. If it be meant to ask, “if anything has been reported or said by ourselves, in our Missionary Reports, tending to show why the school at Athens should be continued,” I can only refer the Special Committee to the whole file of our official correspondence with the Foreign Committee for the last twenty-nine years. If it be asked whether anything has been reported by others respecting us, I can only refer the Special Committee to some 50, 60 or perhaps 100 volumes, by travellers of different nations, who during the last quarter of a century have visited Athens. Their reports, with singular harmony, bear testimony to the importance of this mission. Everything that has been “written, reported or said” by this cloud of witnesses, “tends to show why the schools at Athens *should* be continued.” But to send “copies” of all this mass of testimony, or even the twentieth part of it, would be a task which would, agreeably enough, occupy the remainder of my days, which are already approaching their term, according to the Prophet David. Let others write the history of this Mission—“Non tali auxilio” would—I wish it “to be continued,” or supported, at this waning epoch of my long missionary life. It is possible I may have misunderstood the purport of this 18th question. I can, however, make nothing else out of it but that it is an enquiry, (after 30 years of its existence,) whether it has *ever* been *well* reported of. (See note under this head.)

Ques. 19. Is there any objection to our open declaration that our schools are established for the purpose of so teaching its pupils that they will perceive and reject the errors in doctrine and worship which are held to be existing in the Greek Church? Would such a declaration affect the schools, and in what way?

Ans. 19. Although the same question has already been put in a different form, and answered; that I may not appear to be discourteous, I will reply to this new count—that the course of instruction which has long been pursued with conscientious fidelity, as missionaries of a Protestant Church, in every department of our missionary operations, has ever had for its object the end suggested by this enquiry. As questions arise they are answered; and reasons are given and Scripture resorted to, in order to point out the error or confirm the truth. That is our method of arriving at the end; and as it is the method pointed out by my instructions, and is entirely agreeable to my individual persuasion, and to an experience of its practical results of nearly 30 years, I am prepared to say that I never shall pursue any other, especially after having seen the utter folly and fallacy of the “aggressive and highly offensive system” attempted to be introduced by missionaries of non-Episcopal denominations—*all of whom*, without one exception, have signally failed in Greece.

Ques. 20. Is it known to the Greek Government or Ecclesiasties, or to the

parents of the pupils, that the purpose for which the schools are supported by our Church is to convert the children from the errors of the Greek Church?

Ans. 20. This is the third form of enquiry on the same subject as the preceding; and my answer (in order to give some variety to what else might be tedious) is this: Our "doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith," as well as our objects in coming here, and setting on foot our missionary operations, (including our "schools,") are "fully known to the Greek Government, to the Ecclesiasties, and to the parents of the pupils," not only "in Athens," but throughout Greece and the East; and they are highly appreciated by them, one and all. The greatest desire of the parents of our pupils is, that they should be "converted from the error of their ways," and from all errors, whether of doctrine or practice; and that they should become Christians, "thoroughly instructed in every good word and work." The noble conduct of the parents and guardians of our numerous pupils in 1842, when we were charged by the Russo-fanatical faction with proselyting, and the publicity of our instructions with regard to all those points which we consider erroneous, or as tending to superstition, fully answer this question, I trust.

With regard to the two following questions, their bearing may not at this time be understood without an explanation, though it was not seen how Dr. Hill could misunderstand them in view of all that had passed.

With respect to the 21st: When it was charged that idolatry had been taught in our "Mission" schools, it was simply denied. And when the matter was pressed with proofs, it was said that the "Mission" schools were those for the small children already described, and the boarding school kept at Dr. Hill's house was spoken of as a "pay" school, concerning which it was difficult to get information, as distinguished from what were *then* called "Mission" schools. It was to this boarding school, kept at Dr. Hill's house, which himself and the committee had spoken of as "the pay school," that the committee referred, and it is to this and this only which Dr. Hill himself refers in his answer to the 25th question, and yet he gives to our 21st question the answer found below.

With respect to the 22d, it was well known to Dr. Hill that a communication had been forwarded from Athens and published here, in which it was stated that there were in the pay school some twenty-five or thirty boarders, at \$16 per month, making an annual income of \$4,000 or \$5,000. Dr. Hill, in his reply to this statement addressed to the Foreign Committee, but which, so far as I know, has not been published or read before the Board, says that some of the scholars were taken at under prices, but does not deny or admit the general statement, and it was ascertained that the Foreign Committee did not know the income of this school, or, indeed, what disposition was made of the money sent to Athens. The Special Committee were satisfied, on various grounds, that this school was amply self-supporting, but wished to know the facts from Dr. Hill himself; but his answer was all about some school which was started in 1837 and ended in 1842, respecting which no questions had ever been asked, and of the former existence of which probably not one in twenty of the Board had ever heard, or one of them, under that name.

The fact of the schools being self-supporting I suppose to be the key by which to understand the declaration, twice made in the private circular sent to some members of the Board upon the very eve of the meeting, that it was of little concern to him personally whether the appropriations were continued or not.

The reader can now appreciate the 21st and 22d questions, and their answers, as follows:

Ques. 21. When was the first "pay" school begun, and when was the distinction between the "pay" and "Missionary" school first introduced?

Ans. 21. The first Pay School was commenced in 1837, when the distinction between the terms "Pay School" and "Mission School" was (of course) first introduced. The Pay School terminated in 1842. The whole history of its origin and objects is to be found among the records of the Foreign Committee.

Ques. 22. What has been the gross income in each year of the "pay" school from the beginning—number of pupils, prices for each, and the number in this school taught gratuitously, and the number at rates under the regular charge?

Ans. 22. The pay school, having its origin in the laudable desire of that class of the population of Athens who had some means of their own, to give their daughters the same benefits which the poor were receiving through our schools, was so arranged that while the pupils of that class should receive a somewhat higher education, the advantages of that higher education should be equally enjoyed by another class whom we were preparing to become Teachers. These were selected, of course, from the most promising of our poorer scholars. Besides those whom we thus selected, there was another set of pupils whom we were preparing to become Teachers in the Provinces, in virtue of an arrangement I had made with the Regency (at the outset of the new Government, when there was an utter destitution of means of every kind—not one female school in existence in Athens but our own, and not one teacher of the female sex to be procured throughout Greece). The Regency thankfully accepted my proposal to educate ten poor girls—one from each district—and this measure greatly tended to strengthen our influence both with the Government and the people; for it was a most disinterested as well as a most useful measure, and spoken of as such to the present day. These ten girls we lodged and fed—and in most instances clothed—and educated in the higher branches in the "Pay School;" and we agreed to receive \$4 a month for each from Government—a nominal sum, merely, that it might be said that they were not charity scholars. For every paying boarder pupil, we also took into our house one other, whom we fed, and lodged, and educated *gratuitously*, to become a teacher hereafter. In this way, while provision was being made for a supply of Teachers among the female sex, educated under our eye, and imbued with principles of religion under our instructions, a large class of poor but meritorious girls were deriving all the advantages which the wealthier classes derived from our pay schools, and the class of the poor who paid nothing had the same advantages, religious, moral and intellectual, as the daughters of those who paid for their education. We made no distinction between them. It was, in my opinion, the most godlike work we ever engaged in, and it was *wholly disinterested*. The income derived from the paying pupils was devoted to meet the great outlay of such a system; but like most human calculations, where sordid interests do not come in to the aid of an enterprise, the design was not accomplished, and we were brought into debt by it. Our zeal outstripped our prudence. The result of the whole of this most disinterested scheme, which was broken up by the events of 1842, left us in arrears. We never thought of "making gain of godliness." Our

time, our health, our strength, our private resources, our responsibilities, were sacredly and religiously devoted to carry out one single-minded desire and design—to fulfil our Mission, according to the best light we possessed, in the fear of God, in order to reclaim this people from the darkness of error, by the use of every means which seemed best adapted to their circumstances; and to diffuse, as far and as wide as possible, the light of pure christianity among them. As for all such details as the Special Committee ask of me, I must respectfully refer them to the record of the Foreign Committee of that period, if they still have any doubts which my remarks under this head have left unsettled.

Ques. 23. Who are the teachers in the “pay” schools? Are any of them, or have any of them, been Greek Ecclesiasties or natives? Name the books of religious instruction which are or have been used.

Ans. 23. We commenced our Mission Schools in July, 1831, with about 100 pupils, which steadily increased until in 1842 (when we retired for a few months), at which time we had about 700 gratuitous pupils.

Ques. 24. Are the teachers of this school regarded as Missionaries of the Board?

Ques. 25. What has been the average number in the Mission Schools, now so called, for the past ten years? how many under ten years of age? between ten and fourteen? over fourteen?

Ans. 24 & 25. First—The teachers are all native Greeks, with the exception of ourselves. [In the pay school a French gentleman, Mons. de Pottin, and a Scotch gentleman, Mr. Dickson; the former teacher of French, the latter of English and some branches of Mathematics. Mr. D. was educated at Brown University, R. I.; he is a pious Baptist layman.] Second—Only one of our teachers is of the clerical profession. He is a venerable man of the class already described in the former part of this communication; a professed teacher, engaged as such in the normal (government) school, and giving lessons also in the Orphan (French) Asylum. He teaches Arithmetic and Sacred History. He is not a secular priest, and has no charge or cure, but belongs to a large class of educated monks who are found throughout the East as professors or teachers. They are very useful men, and are preferred as teachers of Greek (ancient), Sacred History and Arithmetic. Scarcely a school exists in which these worthy men are not found—and on my first arrival in Greece there were scarcely to be found any others. Three of these excellent teachers have been elevated to be Bishops (one is the Archbishop of Messenia in the Morea), and of these three, *two* were once teachers in our schools, viz: the present Bishop of Andros and the late Bishop of Doris. Third—The books of religious instruction used in our schools are the Sacred Scriptures, in the modern Greek tongue (first and chiefly); but we make use of a variety of other books as reading books, such as the series of “Peep of Day,” “Line upon Line,” &c., &c., which was translated under my inspection; “Robinson’s Scripture Characters,” “Young Cottager,” and others of a similar kind. Religious instruction is given orally out of the Sacred Scriptures (the modern Greek version). Fourth—In answer to the 25th question, I reply that none of the teachers, either in our Mission schools or in the pay school, are regarded as Missionaries of the Board but myself, Mrs. Hill, and Miss M. B. Baldwin.

Ques. 26. In what buildings are they taught? number and names of the teachers in each year?

Ans. 26. For the last ten years, the Mission schools have had, upon an average, six hundred and fifty pupils. Of these, two hundred are under ten years of age, the remainder from that age to fifteen years. They are taught, at present, and since 1850, in a commodious building, formerly occupied by the

Court of Appeals, adjoining our dwelling house. This arrangement was made in 1850, finding that our school house was, in the present state of Athens, too far removed and too inconveniently situated for us. I arranged with the Demarchy (corporation of the town) to give them a lease of the school house for the purpose of establishing a common school for girls, and upon that condition only; and they not only did so, but appointed one of our former pupils, one of those whom we had educated to be a teacher, as mentioned in the answer to the 22d question. I am happy to say it is a very flourishing school and well conducted. I hired the premises, in which the schools are now commodiously situated, for the same period. The leases terminate on 1st September, 1861. The number of teachers employed each year for the last ten years, has been, upon an average, nine; for several interesting particulars respecting them, and their names, see note.

Some members of the Committee had been led to believe that the duties of Dr. Hill as Chaplain to the English Legation and residents, together with his numerous calls from the influx of visitors, many of them persons of distinction from England and other countries, to whom he was proverbially attentive, must be as much as any one man could well attend to, and would leave no time for Missionary work; but if the following answer be correct, they were wide of the mark. Nor was it known to which of the schools, if to either, he had given any personal attention.

Ques. 27. What average amount of time has been devoted, in each week, to teaching these Mission schools, by Dr. Hill and Mrs. Hill?

Ans. 27. The personal attendance of Mrs. Hill and myself, including not only teaching but supervision, is not to be reckoned by hours or by days of the week; and although (by a strange oversight certainly) Miss Baldwin's name does not appear in this enquiry, it will doubtless be gratifying to the Committee, as it is but justice to her, as one of the Missionaries of the Church, to say in my answer that she too attends with the same assiduity as ever to the duties devolving upon her in her department of Missionary labor. It has, no doubt, escaped the attention of the Special Committee that there are numerous other important duties devolving upon the Missionaries besides the care and supervision of the schools—which, having a complete machinery, and an organization which has been perfected after an experience of so many years, do not need the close and constant presence of the Missionaries. Translations, correspondence, conversation, the important and not-to-be-neglected duty of free intercourse with the people of all classes, from the lowest to the highest, visits of benevolence to the sick and destitute, the distribution of the Scriptures and religious tracts, the preparation of work for the teachers and pupils; these and other various calls of duty connected with our position here must be added to that which indeed “cometh upon us daily”—viz: the care of all the schools. Upon myself, besides, devolves exclusively the maintenance of a very extensive correspondence, not only within the limits of Greece proper, but throughout the Levant, and with many parts of Europe (besides with friends in the United States, shared equally with Mrs. Hill and Miss Baldwin), and in various languages, chiefly Greek and French. I preach, too, a carefully prepared sermon in English every Lord's day—for I have to preach, the greater part of the year, before some of the most learned men of Europe, who make pilgrimages to this renowned city. If the Special Committee or any member of it, however, notwithstanding this general statement of the employments of the Missionaries,

insists upon a categorical reply to the 27th question, I answer *seven hours a day* upon an average, during five days of the week and ten months of the year.

Ques. 28. What books of instruction are used in the Mission Schools—and is any portion of the instruction given, either by books or orally, distinctively Protestant?

Ans. 28. This enquiry has already been answered in part, (see answer to the 24th question.) To be more particular, however, “The books of religious instruction used in these Mission schools,” are first and chiefly the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in the Greek of the present day, (a version prepared by the Br. and Foreign Bible Society, and the only one that exists in modern Greek.) And I desire it to be noted here, as otherwise it will be overlooked, that it is the boast of your missionaries, which no man can justly deprive us of, that—if we have done nothing else—as pioneers of education in Greece, we have been the means of creating thousands of readers and searchers, too, of the Scriptures, who are scattered through the length and breadth of this land, and in other parts of the Levant. Hundreds of these are now mothers, (a few, I believe, are *grandmothers*,) who came to us when they were *children*, and who have taught and are teaching their offspring to love those Scriptures which they learned to read and to love under our instructions. Some of these are in the *Queen’s palace*—others the wives of Governors of Provinces and of Ministers of State—and others inhabitants of hovels! Hand in hand with us in this work has ever gone our much beloved brother in the Gospel, the Rev. F. A. Hildner, of Syra, of the Church Missionary Society, who had just arrived there when we first set foot on Greek soil, in 1830. He, too, has trained many a promising female in the way of righteousness, and, through God’s help, he continues his work with the same zeal.

2. Besides the Scriptures, we have a short Compendium of Sacred History, translated from the German by the Rev. Mr. Hildner. This book is now used instead of the Pentateuch, and historical Books of the Old Testament, which we had formerly in separate parts from the B. and F. Bible Society.

3. The series beginning with “Peep of Day,” &c., “Line upon Line,” (mentioned before,) we find to be exceedingly well adapted for religious instruction to the young. The talented authoress, to whom we sent copies of our Greek translation, wrote Mrs. Hill a letter of thanks, and sent copies of her other works. These books, in their Greek dress, are now used in all the schools throughout Greece, and are highly esteemed. We also use a number of Evangelical tracts translated from the English, all well known to Evangelical Christians, and the compilation known under the title of “Scripture Characters,” by Robinson,—which was among the first of our translations in 1831—and was printed at our own press in Athens, under the faithful direction of my dearly esteemed friend and quondam colleague, the Rev. J. J. Robertson, D.D.

4. A “Manual for Infant Schools,” prepared expressly by us and printed last year; it is the only one of the kind in Greek or in Greece. We dedicated it to the Mayor of the Demos of Peirans, an old and steady friend of ours during 30 years nearly—a public-spirited Magistrate, who has done more for education than any man in Greece. (See note on this subject.)

My reply to the last clause of this 28th question, (“Is any portion of the instruction given, either by books or orally, distinctively Protestant?”) is distinctively this: not a *proportion only*, but *all* the instruction, given either “orally” or by “books,” is “*distinctively*” and *distinctly Protestant*. I am at a loss to conceive how anything else could be expected from Protestant Missionaries, sent out by a Protestant Church; and whose names are not unknown as faithful and loyal

servants of the Church of their fathers and forefathers for more than 40 years. (See a note on this subject.)

Knowing that, according to the written Discipline of the Greek Church, infants receive the communion at the age of forty days, and supposing that to be the common practice, the committee wished to ascertain whether our Mission schools were conducted according to this system. Hence the following question :

Ques. 29. Do the pupils in the "pay" or Mission schools, or both, receive the Communion in the Greek Church, and at what age ?

Ans. 29. As the pupils in our schools (with some half-dozen exceptions) are all baptised members of the Greek Church, it follows that, agreeably to the invariable custom of that Church, they all "receive the communion in the Greek Church." Those under our own immediate care communicate, statedly, only at Christmas and Easter. At these seasons they are carefully and anxiously prepared by us for the due partaking of "that holy mystery," by an explanation of the nature of the Sacrament, of the obligations of those who participate in that privilege—followed by serious exhortation—the reading of portions of the Scripture, and prayer. They seem to all appearance ("God judgeth the heart") to enter upon this service with devout minds. It is, indeed, quite touching to observe with what affection and anxiety, and often with tears, they ask of us (and of each other) on the eve of communicating, forgiveness on our part of all offences "before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup."

If this be true of so large a number, taken promiscuously, it is certainly a most remarkable school, exceeding anything in Christian history.

Ques. 30. Do those of them reported as being converted, either now in the schools, or who have left, continue members of the Greek Church, and hold the same doctrines and continue the same worship as towards the Virgin Mary, Pictures and the Saints, with the other Greeks ?

Ans. 30. All who have been "brought to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus," (as far as we can judge, for "God looketh on the heart,") under our instructions, and who are either *now* in the schools, or have left them, (so far as our knowledge of the latter extends,) have, we trust, abandoned, as they have been taught, the erroneous doctrines and practices enumerated in the question. It has been our constant aim to enlighten all with whom we come into intercourse on such points ; but always with meekness, affection and love—not by angry disputation, abuse, or insult, as the manner of some is.

Ques. 31. What is the number, size, and estimated value of the missionary buildings or other property, and in whom is the legal title vested ?

Ans. 31. The Special Committee is respectfully referred to the records of the Foreign Committee, where they will be able to learn all the particulars embraced under this question.

Ques. 32. When did Dr. Hill become Chaplain to the British Embassy, and what amount of salary as such has he received annually since ?

Ques. 33. What amount of the \$3,300 appropriated to the Mission is applied to Dr. Hill's salary ?

Ans. 32 and 33. My appointment as "Chaplain to the British Legation (not Embassy) and of the English Church at Athens," dates from July, 1845, and I receive an annual stipend of \$460, nett. This appointment was conferred on me without my seeking it, and even without any previous knowledge on my part of any such design. It was the late Lord Lyons (the father of the present English Minister at Washington) who was then H. B. M.'s Representative at this

Court, and whom I had known ever since my settlement in Athens, who solicited and obtained it from the British Government. "Considering it," (as he wrote to me when he sent me my appointment,) "*as justly due to me for my gratuitous services to the English residents and others of our faith, for 12 years previous.*" It was a grateful act of grateful friendship! I had the satisfaction, too, of learning that the late venerated Sir Robert Harry Ingles, (the Representative of the University of Oxford,) the Earl of Carnarvon, Sir Thomas Dyke Aekland, Bart., and others of the highest standing in England, who had all known me personally, (noblemen and gentlemen of different shades of religious views,) had contributed to bring about this very delicate matter; and that the Bishop of London, (the late pious and learned Dr. Blomfield,) who also knew me personally, had at once waived the scruple of my not having English orders. It is said to be the only instance of the kind in the practice of the English Church. It was considered at the time, and it has since proved to be a very important step in advancing the interests of this Mission; and a very important step it has proved itself to be (though without my seeking) in giving me a status in this community that enables me to conduct my missionary labor with greater courage, and with more efficiency; "to be much more bold to preach the Word without fear," as St. Paul expressed himself. From any other point of view, I count the honor and emolument as not worthy to be named! As to the emolument, let not my worthy brethren be alarmed lest I should be "made rich" by the paltry addition of four or five hundred dollars a year to my really poor and scanty salary of \$800 a year, which I have never even asked should be increased during my thirty years' service! In that quarter of a century the cost of living here has increased more than two-fold. A small increase, then, to my salary from an honorable source like this, was much more agreeable to my feelings than to have been obliged to ask the community at home to augment it.

The Foreign Committee in their Report for 1844, says: "They would recommend that the reduction already contemplated be carried on until the close of the year terminating June, 1846; that from that period the annual appropriation be fixed at £500 until otherwise ordered by the Board. With this sum they believe a Mission, still very effective, may be sustained at Athens, until, by the blessing of God, the necessity for it shall cease to exist."

Ques. 34. To what has the remainder been applied? State the items to which the entire sum has been appropriated, native teachers, books, or otherwise.

Ans. 34. The remainder of the sum appropriated to this Mission, after deducting the above salary, has been and is applied to the payment of Miss Baldwin's annual salary of \$250 as a Missionary of the Board, to the payment of the teachers, and the maintenance of the schools; for translations, for books, stationery, house-rent, insurance, repairs, loss on exchange, pensions, charities, &c., &c. (as more particularly entailed in separate note). It will be seen that if this Mission be regarded simply as "*a School in Athens*," (as it seems to be throughout these enquiries,) every pupil costs the Church about five dollars a year! There is not on record, (as far as I know,) a Christian Mission conducted at so cheap a rate, considering its extent and the importance of its position—certainly not one of our Church's Missions.

Ques. 35. In what sense are these schools Christian schools, other than that in which our common schools in which the Bible is read are Christian schools?

Ans. 35. "In what sense the Mission Schools are Christian Schools, other than that in which our Common Schools in which the Bible is read are so?" is

a question which, with deference to the Committee, I must say I do not quite well understand; but I should say (in my endeavor to reply to it), that the Schools under our care—so far as they are a part of our Missionary work—are, in my opinion, greatly superior to any Sunday School I have ever known at home; and on this point my experience may be trusted, inasmuch as I was for many years a Superintendent of those Normal Sunday Schools of “old St. George’s,” in New York, under the early administration of the late Dr. James Milnor, which were admitted to be the best in the city. At the same time Mrs. Hill was one of the teachers in the excellent Female Sunday School of the same congregation. I can safely assure the Special Committee that in whatever sense Sunday Schools in our country are recognized as having any advantages as regards spiritual teaching (religious instruction) over ordinary common schools (even “where the Bible is read”), our schools a great deal more! Our system is more complete, our teachings more impressive and more extensive, because it is a daily service, and not confined to an hour or two once a week. Ours are “*Sunday Schools perpetuated throughout the week!*” And moreover, there is a crowning benefit arising from the existence of these Mission Schools, which places them in advantageous contrast with the Common Schools of our country, “even where the Bible is read,” and even with our Sunday Schools; that whereas in our more favored country religious instruction, of a certain kind at least, and to a certain extent, is distributed almost broad-cast over the whole land; HERE your Mission Schools are, emphatically, the only Schools—with the exception always of those in Syria under Mr. Hildner—the *only Schools* in which the blessed truths of the Gospel are taught, and taught, too, in a *distinctively Protestant way*. It is true (and it is to the praise of the liberality of this Church and Government that it is true) the Holy Scriptures, in the vulgar tongue, are placed in all the Common Schools; but, if read at all, it may easily be fancied how greatly this reading is neglected; and certainly they are never systematically taught; while in our Schools it is not the *secondary* but the one great and prominent object for which our Schools indeed “exist and have their being.” *Religion* is the *primary study*; and “in this sense (in direct reply to your question) our Schools are Christian Schools, *par excellence*”—are Christian Schools (to use the exact phraseology of the question) “in a sense *other* than that in which the Common Schools of America in which the Bible is read are Christian Schools.” In these Common Schools the Bible no doubt is *read*—in our Mission Schools the Bible is *studied*; and its doctrines, precepts and maxims are inculcated, “line upon line, line upon line.”

Ques. 36. What are the devotional exercises in both the pay and Mission schools—by whom in each are they conducted? Are they by extemporaneous or written forms? if the latter, from what source are they taken?

Ans. 36 and last. Forms of prayer are used both at the opening and closing of our Schools; and this from deliberate preference over extemporaneous prayers. The “sources” whence these “forms of prayer” are taken are most orthodox, scriptural and sound; and it will afford me great pleasure to furnish the Special Committee with some of them, or all of them. Were they extemporaneous, I should not have it in my power to prove the orthodoxy of my prayers, nor to give any better references to the “sources” of them, than “the fallible mental capacity” of the individual officiating on the occasion. They are statedly used by the principal teachers in each department, just as in our Sunday Schools at home. (I do not know how this duty is conducted in our Common Schools.) These teachers are *pious females* who have been trained up by us (many of them have been brought up in our family), and their personal piety

may well bear comparison (so far as one can judge), with the best of our Sunday School teachers to whom this duty and other important ministerial duties are confided, and who have ever been considered such valuable assistants to the Pastor. I refer the Special Committee to the Appendix of Notes for copies of some of the prayers used in our Schools.

All of which is respectfully submitted by your obedient servant,

JOHN H. HILL,

Missionary of the Board of Missions of the P. E. Church
in the United States of America.

Such were the questions and such were the answers—answers which, had they respected secular matters, and been submitted to Judge Chambers in a court of justice, he would have dismissed the respondent with a severe reproof. The Special Committee could not be got together before the 4th of October; two of them then were absent. One short session only was practicable, and the Board met on the 10th. The lamented Chairman, who was of course primarily looked to to state and defend the action and purpose of the Committee, was detained by sickness. I never saw him afterward, but a report of some sort being necessary, he drew up and forwarded to me a short one, stating the obstructions which the Committee had encountered, and asking that the Committee be continued and allowed time to prepare a report.

There were but two members of the Committee present in New Haven, and for either of them to do justice to the subject, as then situated, was simply impossible. I, for one, had no idea of being taken at such a disadvantage, and made no reply to the passionate and personal speeches which followed.

The answers were proclaimed, by those who had heard them before the Special Committee, “a triumphant vindication,” though there were members enough who saw that they *must* be deceptive, though they had not the facts to prove it.

But these answers contain the “facts,” and *all* the facts with which Bishop Whittingham tells the Board, in 1865, that I was “confronted” in 1860.

It is possible, however (for such things happened at almost every meeting), that some new traveller, fresh from Greece, repeated the old story about its “mothers,” not one of whom he had ever seen, or could have exchanged a word with if he had. The time for the right had not then come, and of all that has passed since the meeting of 1860 I am uninformed.*

These Notes may be met by silence, or by sneering allusions, or by “brilliant speeches,” or by votes, but the facts will *remain*; and, whether taken on Protestant or on moral grounds, will insure a verdict against the “Mission” at Athens, though judgment be delayed for a hundred years.

* Since these Notes were finished, I have seen the proceedings of the Board in 1861, but they contain nothing which requires particular notice.

CONCLUSIONS.

I. The Greek Church is apostate in whatever sense the Church of Rome is apostate, and on account of her idolatry has been under the frown of the Almighty for twelve hundred years, her history presenting a fearful warning to all not to become partakers of her sins, lest they become partakers of her plagues. Practically, the corruptions of the Greeks prove more destructive to "the life of God in the souls of men" than those of Rome. Certainly since the separation of the East from the West, the number of persons accredited as real Christians have been out of all comparison greater in the Latin Church. Nevertheless, the condition of both makes an appeal to attempt their regeneration by every Scriptural means.

II. The "instructions" under which our first missionaries were sent out were based upon opinions then generally entertained, but which upon better information have been for twenty-five years abandoned by every Protestant Missionary Society in the world except our own, and by no small portion of that.

III. Under these instructions, though not in accordance with the intentions of Bishops White and Griswold, whose names are attached to them, (for the missionaries were also told to be true to their principles as Protestants,) the costly, distracting and futile enterprises of Messrs. Robertson and Southgate were undertaken and concluded.

IV. In the school at Athens doctrines as unscriptural and perilous as any for the rejection of which our fathers shed their blood at the Reformation, have been taught by Mr. Hill and Mrs. Hill, by Greek priests and by other Greek teachers, male and female, with examinations had by Archimandrites and Bishops, who certified to the fidelity with which those doctrines were taught, whereby our Church, hitherto the chief bulwark against Romanism, has been made to give the sanction of Protestantism to the soul-destructive idolatries of the Greek Church.

V. The boarding or pay school at Athens, as an educational establishment, is entitled to all the commendation it has received; as also in its influence upon the social refinement and elevation of the Greek female character.

VI. Secular education and refinement presents no bar to false religions. Who more highly cultivated than the Roman Catholic females of Florence, Vienna, Paris, or Baltimore? The idolatry of the Athenians in the age of Themistocles was as gross as that of the barbarians on the Danube.

VII. As to the spiritual and evangelic results of the school at Athens, if it be asked what is to be made of all the testimonials of so many travellers, I have to reply that in every single instance in which I have conversed with the witnesses, they have but repeated the opinions of others respecting things of which themselves had no knowledge. They had no *opportunity* to acquire such knowledge. I had none—i. e., by conversing with the pupils or graduates—though perhaps taking as much pains to form a probable opinion as any one who has ever visited

Greece. So far as I know, as to the spiritual part of it, there has been, substantially, but one witness, and this witness is Dr. Hill himself; and since the correctness of his views are extensively doubted, it would seem to be the part of wisdom in the Board before proceeding to enlarge and perpetuate a system the working of which, if wrong, must be so disastrous, to ascertain how far this witness has been an example and is likely now to be a competent judge of what spiritual religion is. The case should not be prejudged either way, but be determined by competent and impartial testimony.

But so far from affirming, the present writer has never insinuated or *thought* that *no* spiritual good had been done. Particular good results may take place under a system which cannot be defended. While, therefore, this may be allowed as possible or probable, I submit that no tangible proof of any such results has ever been submitted.

This subject is most painful. The Christian who undertakes to prove *unconversion*, undertakes a task in which he cannot possibly wish himself success. I undertake no such task. But when conversion is *assumed* and forced upon us as an argument in support of unscriptural measures, we are compelled to fall back upon great principles. We cannot at our peril ignore the cardinal revelations of God's Word. I will not adventure an interpretation of Ephesians 5: 5, or say how far the idolatrous corruptions of the Jewish worship were more criminal than those of the heathen who had had no revelation; but it is not to be concealed that among the works of the flesh, which distinguish the children of this world from the children of God, the Apostle enumerates—

1. IDOLATRY.—And while no one would, perhaps, venture to affirm or think that no idolatrous person, Christian, Jewish or heathen, could be in a state of salvation, it is manifest that those who are, must be exceptive cases. It is vain to resort to the frivolous distinctions between pictures and images—(Moses was commanded to destroy the '*pictures*' of the Canaanites, as well as their '*molten images*')—or the frivolous distinctions between *dulia* and *latreia*; for, even if they could be made out, every impartial witness admits that the *simulachra* of the learned are the gods of the people.

2. "HERESY."—It is vain to say that those cannot be in heresy who accept the three creeds, for then there are no heretics in Rome. All Church history shows that fundamental doctrines, received at an early day, and still retained in form, have become practically superseded by the false ones with which they have been overlaid in subsequent ages; as with Rome in her idol worship, which, notwithstanding, does not keep all her worshippers from Christ. So glorious is the Sun of Righteousness that some of His beams pierce through the thick haze of human mediators which she has interposed between the soul and the Lord of glory.

As to the work of evangelization so often asserted to be going on among "the mothers of Greece," and which is the all-prevailing

argument for supporting the present system, it has been as repeatedly asserted here, and in Greece, that not one of them are less adherents of the *doctrine, discipline, or worship* of the Greek Church. Any evidence to disprove this statement has not so much as been attempted; nor has it been denied except in one of the very equivocal replies of Dr. Hill. But if this work of evangelization really be going on in anything approaching the proportion claimed, then it exceeds anything ever effected by the preaching of the Gospel in ancient or modern times. Satan's kingdom in Greece is tumbling down without a struggle or a blow, and apparently without his knowing it. Nothing like this has appeared under the preaching of prophets or apostles, martyrs or reformers, or of Christ himself. What are the spiritual qualities and who are the agents from whom such a mighty influence proceeds? Judging by the entire past of spiritual and evangelic aggression, there is an utter incompatibility between such results and the agency employed.

If these accounts be true, moreover, we have to take in connection the inexplicable fact that the Foreign Committee and Board have, for many years, avowed their purpose to discontinue this Mission upon the death of the present incumbent. If the spiritual results of the Mission have been such as represented by the Foreign Committee, how could they make its continuance personal to Dr. Hill, as they have confessedly long made it?—a question which, I apprehend, can never be satisfactorily answered. But now the Committee are taken upon their own ground, and Bishop Coxe was consistent in providing, at the last meeting, for its continuance; for, upon his theory and their showing, no Mission has approached it in usefulness, and there is no man in the Church, whatever his station, who might not esteem it an honor to resign it, and begin at once to prepare to succeed the present missionary, who is said to be advanced in years.

VIII. We have no light as to when the time shall be for the regeneration of these churches, or the process by which it will be effected. But how was it in the sixteenth century? The work began from *within* and not from without. Our fathers first felt the bondage of their souls to sin and death, notwithstanding their slavish and never finished obedience under the ecclesiastical discipline of Rome. Their darkness was dispersed by the Divine Spirit, and they saw the way of salvation through Christ alone, and cast their idols to the moles and the bats, happily carrying with them, from the Church out of which they were cast, whatever in it of doctrine or discipline was scriptural.

How unlike this are endeavors from *without*, professing *here* to be silently Protestantizing their Church, and disavowing it *there*, where the work is conducted under the vigilant supervision of the priesthood on one side, and laughing politicians on the other!

IX. There is a strange fascination about idolatry, even to avowed skeptics, notwithstanding their scoffs about superstition. Nothing but the presence of an active, evangelic christianity can prevent the grandchildren of those who are now worshipping ideas from worshipping

graven images. Idolatry is the normal condition of the unconverted mind, and it is dangerous for it to continue long in contact with it, however it may have been trained. Missionary annals are not without examples of men going into a heathen atmosphere, and finding heathenism the superior force; and oftener still the fascinations of a corrupted Christianity; and hence the flattering apologies for Romanism from so many Protestant travellers and residents—"they have mingled with the heathen and learned their works."

THE DEBATE AT THE MEETING OF THE BOARD IN 1865, AS REPORTED IN THE CHURCH JOURNAL.

In sympathy and concern for the Greeks temporally and spiritually, the present writer yields to no one. As for their temporal success, I sincerely hope and believe they will yet get Constantinople, and drive the Turks into Asia. Their *spiritual* interests concern me much more; but the question is whether we shall benefit them by compromising our own character, and building them up in an educated idolatry, which is much more resistive of the Gospel.

Upon the remarks of those who opposed the measure for perpetuating the "Mission" in Greece upon its present footing, I have nothing to say. That they are reported in their full argumentative force—judging from past observation—is not at all probable. In one of the speakers I recognize one who has stood clear of party—an able, courageous and consistent member of his own Church. The position which he took so far from being overthrown, was not even encountered upon its merits. As to the speakers upon the other side, the reader must determine whether the assertions ascribed to them (for facts there were none) are not sufficiently refuted in the preceding Notes. There is a single exception, however, to whom (following the example of his eulogistic reporter) I shall give more space than to all the others.

But before proceeding let us notice the *argumentum ad hominem* which the supporters of this mission have attempted to raise. "If the Greeks are as corrupt," they say, "in doctrine and morals as you allege, there is all the more need for sending them light." This is true, but not the point in debate, as they very well know. The point is whether we are not in this attempt sacrificing the principle of the Reformed Church, and in fact, whether, instead of sending them spiritual light, we are not confirming them in spiritual darkness, and (if they choose to raise that question) whether there have been any results in the way of true scriptural conversions, if in fact any are supposable in the case of idolaters under a system which does not convince them of the sin of idolatry, or wean them from it. *This* is the question, and a question which they have never met, and do not now dare to meet, as a question to be determined by the law and the evidence. But let the reader say how far this "argumentum" bears against them. For if (as is undeniable) as many Greeks are already in schools as in some of the American States, how are we called to expend *missionary* funds in teaching them secular

knowledge? and the same as to accomplishments in the boarding school, which many of the contributors to the Mission are unable to give to their own daughters; and if, as Dr. Hill says, the Bible is the first book on the list for native schools; and if, as Bishop Coxe says, there is power enough in the Bible alone to effect their regeneration; and if, as he further says, they are already "more ready to die for Christ than we are;" and if, as Dr. Hill says, they are already "more liberal, generous and free from bigotry than we or any Christians which he knows under the sun;" and if, as Bishop Odenheimer says, "they have as good a right to send missionaries to teach us the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel as we to teach them;" and if, as Bishop Southgate says, "there is little to be reformed in their worship, and that we have as much to learn from them as they from us," it is difficult to see what call they have for our services.

But we must come to the speech of Bishop Coxe, pronounced by the reporter to be of such exceeding "brilliancy," containing more of argument, or at least of appreciable speculation, than we have before chanced to meet on that side, and entitling it to respectful consideration.

Without affirming that any direct testimony has been borne by the mission against the Grecian idolatry, or even denying that it has been formally taught in the schools, he makes four points:

1. *The scriptural method of eradicating error is not by condemning it in terms, but by teaching truth abstractly, leaving it to make its own application, citing the examples of St. Paul and St. John; and moreover that this is the practicable way, citing the example of Wiclif.*

That the usual form of Scripture is positive and not antagonistic and controversial is true, as it also is of every judicious teacher of Christianity, missionary or otherwise. But this is not the point. Are not the exceptions in Scripture so numerous as to be exemplary and obligatory under like circumstances? and must not he who denies it before a scripturally educated assembly be as bold as he can be "brilliant"? Certainly Bishop Coxe's citation of St. Paul, even in his conduct at Athens, is most unfortunate. Did not he say to the idolatrous Athenians, *I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious, and that they ought not to think that the Godhead was like unto gold or silver or stones graven by art and man's device*, and command them to *repent*, warning them that *God had appointed a day in which he would judge the world for idolatry*? And did he not, immediately after his conversion, without conferring "with flesh and blood," "*speak boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, disputing against the Grecians,*" so much so that "*they went about to kill him*"? And did he not tell the men of Lystra to "*turn from these vanities (of idols) unto the living God,*" and comfort the disciples in view of the uproar which his doctrine had made, telling them that *through much tribulation they must enter the kingdom of God*? And did not he and Barnabas have "*no small dissension and disputation,*" (just as we have now) with those who would have persuaded him to tolerate Jewish superstitions? And on another occasion

did not Paul at the close of a most solemn appeal to his brethren according to the flesh, for whom his heart was ready to break, warn them to "*beware lest that which was spoken by the prophet come upon them*"? "*behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish.*" And how did he deal with errors and false teachers in the churches of Galatia? Did he lay down general principles and leave them to make their own application, or make them himself to the very errors and teachers who were leading them astray, warning them against even an angel from heaven, should he come preaching any other gospel. And do not idolaters of modern Athens need this as much? But if you were to attempt this, says Bishop Coxe, you would be driven out. So was Paul driven out, and driven from country to country. "Nevertheless certain came unto him," says Bishop Coxe. So they did; but *who were they*, under *his* missionary conduct now justly set forth? They were *only* Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them. They were not an idolatrous and admiring priesthood, continuing as idolatrous and as friendly after a ministry of thirty years.

Nor is St. John more to Bishop Coxe's purpose. "*Little children, keep yourselves from idols,*" or as an old reformer translated it, in controversy upon this very point, with the stake in view, "*Babes, keep yourselves from images.*"

And our blessed Saviour, also, our example and the living impersonation of wisdom and charity, he did not always or even commonly lay down general principles and leave them to make their own application, but he made the application himself. Hence his constant specification of sins and errors by *name*, and his reproofs of the priests and the lawyers and the scribes and Pharisees, telling them before the multitude how their doctrine contradicted and subverted his. Take also our Lord's addresses to the seven Churches, sent them after his ascension into heaven. To one of which, with surprising inconsiderateness, Bishop Coxe alludes. If you would know the true bearing of those addresses upon the question before us, read over the solemn specification of the sins of those Churches, then in the beginning of their apostacy—and not one of which, save Smyrna, against which nothing was said, has now even a name to live—and say whether this proposition that we are to lay down truth without censuring particular corruptions, if prescribed as a canon for the conduct of missionaries among corrupt Christian Churches, be not in direct and awful contrast with these last teachings of Christ. *

* It is this plan of laying down general principles and leaving them to make their own applications which is pleaded, and which works so disastrously for religion, with respect to preaching against "poms and vanities," with too many in our city churches, the influence of which, alas, is fast spreading into the country. Ask those who are "living in pleasure"—as manifestly worldly and irreligious lives as any to be found—whether, when they belonged to a class for confirmation, or at any time since, they ever heard their pastor point out any particular thing which he considered a "pom" or a "vanity," showing its inconsistency with a christian profession, and they will tell you—no. "Poms and vanities" have come to be commonly spoken of with a smile; and the

Has Bishop Coxe's theory of Reformation, then, anything in Scripture to support it? Most manifestly it has not, but directly the reverse. But he must needs also attempt history, and endeavor to show from it that his theory is the most practicable theory; and to this end cites the example of Wielif, saying that he pursued the work of translating the Scriptures in private, and that the present writer (who was not there to speak for himself) would have condemned him for not provoking the persecution of Rome, and moreover would on that account "have docked him off from the list of Missionaries." One can hardly believe his own ears when he hears such an argument addressed to such an assembly by a Bishop who must be supposed to be a man of education and integrity. It is, moreover, difficult to suppress one's indignation at seeing a greater dishonor put by Protestant hands upon the memory of this "Morning Star of the Reformation" than Rome put upon his ashes by throwing them into the Swift.

Wieliff was born and nurtured in the darkness of the fourteenth century. But, through God's merey, coming to a partial knowledge of the truth, it was not in Popes or Synods to intimidate him. He knew nothing of this policy of concealment and winning the favor of the enemies of the truth by suppressing his convictions. With all Christendom for an opponent, he boldly attacked transubstantiation and such other of the Pope's doctrine as, by the rule of God's word, he deemed corrupt and dangerous to the soul. And he not only attacked corrupt doctrine, but he attacked corrupt men—the priesthood, guilty of idolatry, licentiousness and simony. There was no fraternization with corruption. "Let old curates wax rotten in sin, and let them not do their office by God's law. * * * For we will maintain lords to live in their lusts, extortions and other sins, and the Commons covetize lechery and other deceits, with false swearing and many guiles; and also the curates in their damnation for leaving of their ghostly office, and

minister who names them, save in the baptismal service, where they strike even the skeptic listener as most solemn, is in danger of provoking merriment.

But again, I am not a little jealous of this canon about general propositions, taught *positively*, without directly controverting the opinions which they are supposed to contradict, on another ground, and that is the use commonly made of this method for the stealthy inculcation of error. It is hard to understand men who, in connection with their positive teaching of what they call truth, do not as positively and honestly state what they call error. This is the almost uniform method of doctrinal corruption in its first stages. This was the way of Unitarianism in New England. For a long time it was all positive teaching—no controversy, nothing to give alarm, no mention of Trinitarianism or Trinitarians. The apostacy was more than half accomplished before it was suspected. Again, it is often hard for an upright teacher to make clear what he *means* by truth, unless he also states its antagonistic error. This was Christ's method with the Scribes and Pharisees. He told them first what the Scriptures taught, and then what their traditions taught, and made them see the contradiction. And this is what every honest teacher, who is well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, will do, whether in parishes or in missionary fields.

to be the procurators of the devil for drawing all men to hell." This is little in the dialect of Dr. Hill and his apologists. This primitive reformer, like every other who has had any success, *did* provoke controversy and persecution, and it was but the friendly hand of paralysis which snatched him from the stake. "He had his faults," says Fuller, "and were I to conceal one of them, that glorious saint would sooner chide than thank me." But it is not to be endured that in such a connection Bishop Coxe should claim to be of the spiritual progeny of Wiclif and exclude those who are. Had his tortuous policy been pursued a hundred years later, there would have been no fires at Smithfield and none at Oxford.

2. Bishop Coxe's second point, and his main point, is this, that the whole Bible is taught in the school at Athens. "Now it was never yet so much as pretended by anybody that the Holy Scriptures were not faithfully taught in that school, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalypse." And he draws a contrast between Rome and the Greeks on this point, saying that the latter do not object to the circulation of the Scriptures. But Rome says that *she* does not object to the circulation of the Scriptures, *provided* she can be sure that *her* own interpretation will go along with them. And do not the Greeks take as good care that *their* interpretations *shall* go along with their Bible? And as to the Bible being all faithfully taught in this school, whether it be so or not, Bishop Coxe of course personally knows nothing at all, nor any witness that ever appeared before the Board; nor does anybody know except the teacher himself; and when he assumes that this has never been denied, he assumes what is contrary to the fact, for this is the very thing which has been denied from the beginning. *My* reason for not believing this, is Dr. Hill's own statement. He says, in his letter to the Greeks already quoted (p. 23), and which was published for them and not for us, nor known to us for sixteen years, that he taught the girls the "*morality* of the gospel" and "*the religion* of their parents," or, "according to the creed of their fathers," "avoiding all interference with the doctrines of the Oriental Church, and observing a strict silence about his own." That (agreeably to his distinction) he does teach the *morality* of the gospel, *i. e.* as it regards lying, stealing, &c., I believe, and I as fully believe the other part of his statement that he teaches the doctrinal system of the Greek Church, not only on account of the detailed and circumstantial evidence which he submits to convince the Greeks, who were at home and had the facts under their eyes, and could not be deceived, but also because the highest ecclesiastical authority of Greece has confirmed Dr. Hill's statement after a protracted and searching examination of the school itself. And, as if to cut off the last possibility of dispute, the testimony of the parents of the girls is published, declaring that their course, after returning from school, proved that their creed had not been impaired. These Greek testimonials I affirm have *never* been denied, even—to use Dr. Hill's expression (which I have always been willing to believe his Greek friend put in for him,

though it is not specifically claimed)—“by the most audacious sycophant.”

And are we to be told, in the face of all this, that Dr. Hill “has taught the whole Bible faithfully”—that he could go through “from Genesis to Revelation” and not come in conflict with the Greek “religion” upon *the Rule of Faith, Justification, Auricular Confession, Transubstantiation*, and the *Worship of Images*? No. He has passed these things over, or, as the Greeks believe, he has explained Scripture in accordance with their views.

3. The third point of the argument is the great usefulness of the schools. “Five thousand mothers of Greece,” says Bishop Coxe, have been trained in the Scriptures; and this is repeated some four or five times. It is an ungracious task to mar so fine a picture by coldly scrutinizing numbers, which are indeed of little moment in comparison with the doctrinal system in which so many mothers have been trained. But Dr. Hill in his “Answers” only claims “several hundred mothers,” and he “thinks a few grandmothers,” and one would suppose that a school of from “twenty-five to thirty,” graduating ten or at most fifteen a year, could hardly have produced more in the time; for in what are called the “mission” schools, taught by natives, and where it is not probable that Dr. Hill exerts any appreciable influence, he appears not to put in any claim of this sort. But when we get into the open sea of fancy, where poetic imagination spreads her wings, hundreds swell to thousands and thousands to millions.

But although much of the staple of these “brilliant and effective” speeches about the “mothers of Greece” is sheer imagination, yet some mothers have been trained, and there is no reason to doubt Dr. Hill’s estimate of the number. But suppose there had been but twenty trained in the pure faith, and whose training had resulted in the conversion of their souls, the value of the work could not be computed by years, or labor, or expense. But if the training be such as that laid down in Dr. Hill’s letter, and these mothers continue as much worshippers of images as before, how can those who support the system be free from misprision of idolatry? *

* “These schools” said that great missionary, Dr. Judson, “are beautiful things to show to foreign travellers,” intimating, as he goes on to show, that for purposes of evangelization they were as fallacious in appearance as they were beautiful. This opens a subject which had perhaps better not be opened at all without carrying it further and showing from missionary history the danger of carrying education much in advance of evangelization. This is certainly so in India and other partially civilized countries where false religions are systematized and fortified by speculative theology. Of the youth in such countries who have been carried through the higher course of a European education, but an exceedingly small proportion, perhaps not more than two or three per cent., have become Christians, while the remainder have produced some of the worst enemies which Christianity has had to contend with in those lands.

In the last conversation that I ever had with the lamented Mr. Hoffmann, he fully coincided in this view, though he thought, as I also do, that Africa was an

With regard to the "reforming Bishops preaching the pure word of God" of which Bishop Coxe speaks, and seems in some way to connect with our influence there, it may be so, but it is to be presumed that he has no definite information. For many years such vague statements have reached us from those countries, but they have died away; so that now, upon a new rumor or report, we know not what to believe. But it is no doubt true that in proportion to the increase of education and social refinement, the grosser forms of superstition disappear. It is certainly so in Romish countries. But here again comes in the discouraging fact about education, that it is easier to make converts of Romanists in Ireland than in England, and everywhere in the Provinces than in the Capital.

4. The superiority of Greeks to Protestants in their willingness to suffer for Christ. This is the fourth point made.

All creeds have had their martyrs, even Atheism, as Vanani, in Paris, in 1616. In an age of superstition death for Christ was a passion, even among such as gave no other evidence of being prepared to die but their impatience for the amphitheatre or the stake. But if this position be in any sound sense true, it is a most weighty argument against all the Reformed Churches.

5. Bishop Coxe says in conclusion—"If news should come to-night that the Pope was willing that the Board should establish a school on the Vatican, where we might freely teach the whole Bible in the vernacular, he would be willing to go himself and begin the work. He would be willing to say nothing about darkness if he could only go and bring in the light." Upon which ensue some of the severest reflections upon Rome. But why such passionate denunciations against Rome in this particular connection? I must protest in her behalf against the unequal hand which the Bishop holds between the two sisters. *Suum cuique tribuito*. In view of comparisons so unjust I must put in a word for the Church of Fencelon, Pascal and Jansenius, and a considerable company besides, who must be confessed to have illustrated the christian name.

But if Bishop Coxe will agree to make no harder conditions with the Pope than he makes with the Greeks, he may be sure of a hearty welcome, even on the Vatican. If he will give the Pope as substantial evidence of his trustworthiness as Dr. Hill has given the Greeks, and agree that Franciscans in the school shall hear the creed of Pius IV. and Jesuits or Benedictines hear confessions, and "the head of the

exception, where the superstitions are too gross and absurd to withstand even the smallest intellectual culture. At the mention of this beloved name, I cannot forbear to express my admiration of his character. During a sojourn of some days at my house, I was profoundly impressed with the fact that I was honored probably for the last time with the society of one "great in the kingdom of heaven," a great missionary intellectually as well as spiritually. He chose a field in which little of human glory was to be won, has finished his course, and in the memory and affections of the Church will be numbered with Martyn, Weithbrecht and Marsden.

Church in" Rome, with the Cardinals and Bishops, make examinations and certify that Bishop Coxe has not so interpreted his whole Bible as to endanger the doctrine of these vigilant functionaries, then he may be perfectly certain that all the girls in Italy will be at his command, and he can expend any amount in teaching them "the *morality* of the gospel and the *religion* of their fathers," adding music, dancing and whatever other accomplishments he may see fit, and he will be as popular at Rome as Dr. Hill at Athens. Whether it would be possible for him to produce "five thousand mothers" in thirty years is doubtful, but certainly as many as any school ever did produce.

But the very conception of such a school is founded in—what shall I say? *Could* he accept such a proposition on the terms which he himself prescribes, going with the secret purpose to accomplish a design which he knows is not suspected, and which he stipulates not to divulge, by speaking about darkness?—in the daytime on terms of intimacy with the Papal household, and in the night digging a mine to be sprung a hundred years hence, and blow the Papal fabric to perdition! And it is *here* that this Greek Mission, taken upon the plea of its supporters, binds upon the sensibilities of honor, and gives pain. I but speak what I know, when I say that there have been some, (Bishops, Presbyters and laymen,) than whom none by character have given greater credit to the Board—who have felt that uneasiness inseparable from upright minds when that is being attempted indirectly which it is not dared to avow and attempt openly. This is upon the supposition that the seeds of a Protestant Reformation are being planted in Greece. If it be so, the Greeks have no suspicion of it; and I venture to say that if this very speech of Bishop Coxe's should be faithfully translated and read to the Holy Synod, and mean *there* what it was intended to mean *here*, nothing but their knowing it to be untrue, and their unbounded confidence in Dr. Hill, could save his school one week.

But the Greeks are at home and will see to their own, while the laboring oar is put into the hands of those, five thousand miles off, who are striving, if possible, to maintain the Protestant integrity of our reformed Church. But there is little chance of success so long as facts, attested by every condition which the laws of evidence demand, and what Mr. Burke would call the eternal constitution of things, are set at naught by the old tale new-coined at Athens, and brilliant speeches, backed by party spirit which no arrows can pierce and no discipline can tame.

Bishop Coxe intimates that at the late meeting there was a "passionate debate." I am astonished to hear it after both the principle and conduct of the Mission at Athens have been so often and "triumphantly vindicated"; and yet I am not astonished, for truth, though out-voted and silenced, can never be ultimately crushed.

It is said (and the result is inevitable) that this advance movement at Athens is from henceforth to be made tributary to the "Russo-Greek" movement. Nor, with the facts as stated and proved in the preceding

Notes, is it easy to see how those who support the one should hesitate to support the other. If what has been done at Athens has been well done, and is right in principle, and such good results have followed, then, clearly, more of the same sort ought to be done. Yet some of the supporters of Athens will probably hold off from the Russian scheme, but their opponents will not be slow to avail themselves of their advantage.

The origin and intent of this Russian scheme are in no way obscure. Its inception is coeval with that to un-Protestantize our Church, and is part and parcel of it. Some twenty-five years since the present writer had a long conversation with one of the prominent "tract" writers at Oxford, who had just returned from Russia. He was full of the notion of "intereommunion." He did not speak at all of any good which the Church of England had to impart to the Church of Russia, but exclusively of the good which the Church of Russia had to impart to the Church of England. I called his attention to the testimony borne by all the historians to the Erastianism and extreme depravity of the Greek Church in Russia, both in doctrine and morals. Without admitting or denying this, he manifested no concern whether it was so or not, but insisted that England might get from Russia "a better idea of a Church." Upon my enquiring what were the benefits likely to be derived to England from this "better idea" which had, nevertheless, proved itself, for so many ages, compatible with such intellectual and moral degradation, he made no reply.

The party which began this scheme in England has pursued it steadily ever since, though contenting itself for some years with propositions to the public which appeared to be at least harmless.

The first proposition here was "to collect information," which, if impartially conducted, is a very harmless thing, and might be useful; but the quality of the information collected will depend very much upon the party collecting it; and if good grounds should appear for suspecting it to be erroneous or partial, the task of verifying it or supplementing it with other facts, essential to a just judgment, will be very difficult; nor will there be wanting those who will endeavor to make it odious.

In due time the whole Church in her legislative capacity will be called upon to give its sanction to measures, the real significance of which only a small number will know anything about.

Parties will divide, and a minority at least will perceive that the practical working of this scheme will be to put the prime articles of our faith in abeyance in order to *build up a system of externalism, and make whatever of influence may in time come from abroad bear against the truth at home.* But they will be held at every possible disadvantage, and may esteem themselves happy if they escape personal attacks for their honest endeavors to conserve the principles of the Reformation.

If it be said that we assume that this movement does not look to the regeneration of the Russians in righteousness and true holiness, we answer that we do not affirm or assume anything upon this point. It is proba-

ble enough that persons of a peculiar cast of mind like Bishop Coxe may have some devout imaginations, or hopes of this sort. We only say that the idea of convincing the Russo-Greeks of sin, and weaning them from idolatry and superstition, and bringing them to a knowledge of salvation through faith in Christ, has not come into the foreground in this movement, or even been alluded to so far as we have seen. At the most important meeting held in England, as reported by its own friends, nothing of this sort was alluded to, or any reference made to any benefits whatsoever to be tendered to the Russian Church, much less was there any allusion to concessions on its part. But the political agent of Russia, who was invited to the meeting and took a prominent part, did very distinctly intimate what would be required of the Church of England in order to intercommunion. "In conclusion I moved," he says, "1. That works should be published in England, setting forth the history, doctrine, and present condition of the Anglican Church, with a view to proving that it is not a Protestant but a Catholic Church, and accordingly related to the Eastern Church." It is noticeable that at this meeting, so far as appears, the parties knew as little of each other's minds as the parties at "World's Conventions" for harmonizing Christendom, and that whatever was said of any appreciable distinctness came from the Russians, so proverbial for diplomatic concealment of their designs. If this matter be pressed we shall have another permanent and prolific source of contention at home; and what have we to hope for abroad? We are told already that we have no concessions to ask from the Russians, the only question being what concessions shall we make to them. One says we must concede the "filioque," which, though a Scriptural truth and a doctrine of our Church, is but as a mole-hill to a mountain in comparison with other points which will have to be conceded before Russia will consent to negotiate; which was sufficiently intimated to the wooing party at the meeting referred to, by the summary manner in which Prince Orloff bluffed off every measure which looked to anything practical. But suppose a negotiation inaugurated, what chance is there that any appreciable influence will be exerted by a Church so feeble and so remote as ours upon one with a priesthood between fifty and sixty thousand strong, and which is strictly governed by the most crafty and ambitious political power in Europe? For since Peter the Great entered the Synod of Moscow, in the year 1700, abolishing the Patriarchate and annihilating the independence of the prelates and consistories, the Church has been the mere engine of the State; and it is perfectly certain that no foreign negotiation would be allowed to proceed one inch without the surveillance of the political power, and subjection to its designs.

But finally, to suppose the best, let us suppose the design to be simply and purely that of carrying the light of the Gospel into the darkness of the Russo-Greek religion, that thereby we may become the instruments of saving their souls from sin, the question may be asked whether we have not a scriptural warrant to attempt such a work among all men?

To this question we reply, that we have no scriptural warrant to approach any people, when, in order to access, it must be stipulated in advance not to declare the whole counsel of God, as ourselves understand it. If this be the condition, then God's time for benefitting such people by us has not yet come. "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart," said the great Apostle, speaking of his "kinsmen according to the flesh;" yet he had to abandon them—God's ancient Church and people—and turn to the Gentiles. Yet even the Jews at this day are nowhere so barred up by civil statutes and constitutions against the Gospel as the lapsed Churches of the East; while the whole heathen world lies open to our missions.
